

A 744,500

PROPERTY OF

*The  
University of  
Michigan  
Libraries*

1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS













**BOOKS BY ARNOLD FORSTER**

**ANTI-SEMITISM—1947**

**A MEASURE OF FREEDOM**

**BOOKS BY BENJAMIN EPSTEIN**

**COLD POGROM *translated from the German***

**COLLECTED ESSAYS ON MASYRK *translated from the German***

# THE TROUBLE

AN ANTI-DEFAMATION

LEAGUE REPORT

BY

ARNOLD FORSTER

AND

# MAKERS

BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN

1952

DOUBLEDAY & COMPANY, INC.

GARDEN CITY

N.Y.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 52-7114

Copyright, 1952, by The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith  
All Rights Reserved

Printed in the United States

at

The Country Life Press, Garden City, N.Y.

First Edition



gift  
Amer. Zionist  
Council  
6 SW.

**TO OUR CHILDREN    Ellen, David, Stuart, Jane,  
and all their contemporaries  
. . . so that these prejudices may  
not confront them tomorrow.**



**AUTHORS'  
ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

More than fifty men and women of the Anti-Defamation League participated in the co-ordinated research necessary for this book: to all of them our heartfelt appreciation. To Gerold Frank, especially, goes our deep gratitude for his painstaking editorial assistance on the entire manuscript. Our thanks to Jack Baker-Bachrach, Harold Braverman, Louis Krapin, and Monroe R. Sheinberg for the accumulation of facts which form the backbone of our story. And we are indebted to Nathan C. Belth, Oscar Cohen, J. Harold Saks, and Frank N. Trager, who served as a planning board for the development of this work.

**A. F., B. R. E.**





We live in a disturbed world today—a fearful world. But on the major issues of peace and war, we know where the trouble lies and who the troublemakers are. To that degree at least we have a clear view of our problems.

But consider the problems within; the troublemakers in our midst. The former are not easy to define; nor are the latter always easily recognized. Yet, our failure to deal adequately with our internal situation may, in the final analysis, keep us from coping successfully with the enemy abroad.

## FOREWORD

The issues of peace and war arise out of a conflict of ideas—the ideas of freedom against the ideas of totalitarianism. To the degree that the ideals and the practices we preach remain unfulfilled in our own land, to that degree we suffer loss of strength in our fight for a free world. Every democratic failure in our national life is a sign of weakness to the rest of the world; every breakdown at home a setback on the international front. We can lose the free world by our own mistakes more readily than because of any superior strength or the greater but false promises of Communism.

The world has long listened to

## FOREWORD

the promise of democracy; it is a tired, disillusioned world looking for security and rest. If it is to continue to fight, the rewards must be worth fighting for. The world no longer asks us: "What of your promises?" It asks: "What of your performance on those promises?"

This book is about some of the causes of failure in our democratic performance. It is about the troublemakers in our midst—the peddlers and practitioners of prejudice. It is also about an area of our national life that the people of the world watch very closely—the treatment of minorities. They ask logically enough: "When you talk of democracy do you mean democracy for all Americans, or only for some? When you speak of a free world, do you mean a free world for some or for all?"

Does the free world we speak of include everybody? They have reason to ask—for most of the world differs from us in color of skin or religious persuasion, and they know that if the troublemakers are setting the pace in the United States the American promise is not for them.

For that reason, this is an important book for every American. It is intended to show us our ills, and since this is not a Greek tragedy the malady need not be fatal if we will only seek—within the framework of a democratic society—the cure which is readily at hand.

*The Troublemakers* was undertaken at the direction of the Civil Rights Committee of the Anti-Defamation League, of which Jacob Grumet is chairman, and David Rose and Henry E. Schultz are vice chairmen. Its members are: Leo Abrams, Alan Alheimer, Louis A. Kohn, Edward Levi, Arnold H. Maremont, Bernard Nath, Nathaniel L. Nathanson, A. N. Pritzker, Benjamin Samuels—all of Chicago; Henry Epstein, Martin M. Frank, S. Arthur Glixon, Lester Gutterman, Samuel Kramer, Samuel Markle, Norman Newhouse, Louis A. Novins, J. Irwin Shapiro, Sidney Sugerman—all of New York; William Bloom, Tuscaloosa; Joseph Cohen, Kansas City, Kansas; David Cole-

man, Los Angeles; William Gerber, Philadelphia; Joseph Gottlieb, Boston; John Horwitz, Oklahoma City; Frank R. S. Kaplan, Pittsburgh; Harry Lashkowitz, Fargo, N.D.; and Charles W. Morris of Louisville, Ky.

The reader of these pages will find in them not only ammunition for the war to make our land a more perfect democracy, but also an action story, based on fact and truth, that will keep him on the edge of his seat, and, he will find that he, himself, is frequently the victim of the villains of the piece.

Meier Steinbrink

National Chairman, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith





**FOREWORD 11**

**1.**

**THE WHEEL OF HATE 19**

**2.**

**THE SMEAR 25**

**3.**

**MEDICINE MEN 75**

**4.**

**INVASION 169**

**5.**

**NETWORK 197**

**6.**

**CONFUSION FROM THE LEFT 217**

**7.**

**BALLOTS FOR BIGOTRY 233**

**8.**

**BARBED WIRE 255**

**9.**

**VIOLENT HARVEST 277**

**CONTENTS**

**A FINAL WORD 301**

**INDEX 307**



## **THE TROUBLEMAKERS**



# 1

## THE WHEEL OF HATE

This is a book about troublemakers—those among us who are causing trouble in America by means of racial and religious prejudice. We propose to name them in the following pages, to describe their activities, and to point out how they harm American democracy and the American people.

The disturbers, the nuisances, the dishonest, the irresponsible, the unscrupulous are found, to be sure, in every phase of American life—political, economic, and social. This book makes no attempt to survey the entire scene. It concerns itself essentially with the field of bigotry; and what is revealed there is sufficiently widespread and sufficiently alarming, we feel, to merit the attention of all thoughtful men and women.

The subject, we believe, is of far more than academic interest. It reaches into the lives of all of us, regardless of race, color, or creed. The authors of this book, by the nature of their work, have been involved in this field for a number of years. Across our desks, day in and day out, pours an astonishing stream of evidence pointing to the existence in this country of a vast enterprise of prejudice, bigotry, and

## 1 THE WHEEL OF HATE

what frequently may only be described as psychopathic hatred. This enterprise feeds upon domestic disputes. It capitalizes upon international strife. Its ostensible victims are the members of minority groups; but its real victim is the United States—the entire American people, who often are unaware of how they are being deceived and made party to activities both reprehensible and dangerous to the nation.

The troublemakers are those who carry on this enterprise—and who in the last few years have been actively and busily engaged in this destructive and un-American work.

Even within the field of this book's interest—that of prejudice—we have not attempted to cover every field of activity. We take up prejudice as a tool in the smear, or character assassination, of public figures. We examine the lives and works of professional hatemongers—men whose stock in trade is the skillful exploitation of prejudice against Catholics, Jews, Negroes, and other minorities. We deal with national and international issues which the unscrupulous twist and distort, by means of prejudice, to make democracy over in their image. We expose the use of prejudice by troublemakers from abroad to divide the American people along religious lines. We discuss the Communist Party's use of the fight against prejudice to spread its propaganda and to confuse and hamper genuine supporters of civil rights. We go into the effect of prejudice in housing. We discuss prejudice as a factor in election campaigns. And finally we deal with what is frequently the ultimate and inevitable harvest of the racial and religious prejudice sown by the troublemakers—violence, and even death.

It will be seen by the reader that no one individual among the troublemakers we name confines himself to a single area of activity. Many of these persons appear and reappear in the following pages—apparently improvising as they go along, but actually working along clearly defined lines, frequently in co-

operation with one another, to reach their goals through skillful if demagogic appeals to one kind of prejudice or another.

The troublemakers we have chosen belong to both the right and the left. They are to be found in high places, and among the rank and file of the people. It is not too difficult to recognize them—not only by what they do, but by how they do it. The troublemakers are those who poison the wellsprings of information by pouring in racial and religious prejudice; by subverting that honest exchange of opinion by which our citizens make up their minds on issues, they help determine American policy by supporting or rejecting those issues. The troublemakers are the super-patriots, contemptuous of constitutional protections for all save themselves, who smear and foully attack those with whom they disagree. The troublemakers are those who appeal to racism in election campaigns, and those who prevent their fellow Americans from finding jobs and shelter because of race, color, or creed.

Our concern with a Merwin K. Hart does not grow out of the fact that he disagrees with us as to the need for fair employment practices laws. He has a right to his view—as have we. But when Merwin Hart attacks FEPC legislation as an “alien attempt” to “compel people to employ certain individuals and not employ others,” he is guilty of a calculated distortion of the facts and is appealing to prejudice. He is deliberately deceiving thousands of Americans whose attention he has. By misleading them on this important subject, by making it appear to be what it is not, he is sabotaging democracy.

When a George Armstrong proclaims that the United States was forced into the Korean war by Zionists seeking a world dictatorship, he is playing the same tune, if in a more fantastic key. When an Upton Close, speaking to thousands over the air, attacks the United Nations and our country's participation in it, charging that the U.N. is a “socialist plot,” he may well be compared to Hart and Armstrong. When a Robert Wil-

## 1 THE WHEEL OF HATE

liams declares in pamphlets which he spreads throughout the United States that "Communism is . . . the domination of Whites by racial and social minorities under Jewish direction leading to the liquidation of Christianity," and a Reverend Wesley Swift declares that Secretary of State Acheson is "a stooge for Stalin—a Felix Frankfurter appointee," and that John Foster Dulles "is also a stooge for these Jews and is not to be trusted"—Williams and Swift belong in the same shameful cabal.

Our concern is not with the man who opposes Federal aid to education because he fears that State rights will be violated; we are concerned with the man who attacks it, and smears those who support it, on the spurious ground that it is a Communist conspiracy to seize and control the minds of American youth. So with those who attack the treaty against genocide, not because they fear that it may impair United States sovereignty, but because it is allegedly a Jewish plot which seeks to "equate the Asiatic hordes" with "White Americans." So with all the others who by use of the "big lie," in high places and low, deceive and mislead the American people.

All these troublemakers are poisoning free discussion, which is the very essence of a democracy. In some respects, it is as damaging as the totalitarian practice of cutting off free discussion altogether. In totalitarian countries the honest voter knows that he is being forced to register an opinion which is not his own. The techniques of the troublemakers, far more subtle, lead many an American to think that he is registering his own freely considered opinion when—acting on distorted and falsified information—he votes for or against important issues of public policy.

The troublemakers and their attempts to hoodwink their fellow Americans must be brought into the light of public knowledge. As American citizens, they have the privilege of free speech even though we recognize them for what they are



and regardless of how strenuously we or others may disagree with them. But certainly, we feel, the American people are entitled to know *who* they are, and *how* they misuse free speech, and *how* they subvert education, information, and propaganda.

But there is an even larger perspective in which the troublemakers and their works should be placed. This book was not written simply because its authors are ideologically opposed to what the troublemakers stand for, and by this means seek to express moral indignation. Nor was it written solely because the troublemakers are bringing suffering to thousands of innocent men and women. It was written also because we are convinced that the activities exposed in these pages represent a serious danger to the nation.

Our country today is in a state of national emergency. We confront powerful and ruthless enemies. We may one day be engaged in a global conflict, with terrifying consequences. At this critical juncture, the American citizen bears an important responsibility. He finds himself living in an atmosphere marked by witch hunts and Communist infiltration, by moral deterioration, by disillusionment, cynicism, and distrust. He must avoid apathy or hysteria, and judge, sanely and wisely, the endless succession of trying issues coming before him.

It is during this difficult time that troublemakers become a major menace. For it is they—the breeders of hate and the midwives of hysteria—who create friction and disharmony among us; who encourage suspicion of our fellow citizens; who set group against group within the nation. It is they who play the game of our enemies, sabotaging our unity from within and feeding those abroad who make use of every failure of democracy to attempt to divide us from the free world which is our ally.

None of us knows how long this crucial hour may last. The crisis of today may be one of months, years, or decades. But

## **1 THE WHEEL OF HATE**

**this much is apparent. The damage caused by the troublemakers is one compounded by time. The poisons with which they fill the minds of the American people, if not counteracted, may well spread by geometric progression. To the degree to which the troublemakers are successful, to that degree they destroy that American strength and national co-operation needed so badly not only today, but in the months and years to come.**

# 2

## THE SMEAR

On November 9, 1950, when Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg of New York learned that Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall had named her Assistant Secretary in charge of man power, she had every reason to be proud.

A prominent citizen, born in Hungary, she had come to this country (as a child of ten) with her parents. Since then, her story had become a classic chapter in the American chronicle of success. Now, at the age of forty-nine, she was recognized as an extraordinarily capable woman, who for more than twenty years had exhibited something close to genius in getting tough jobs done on the highest levels. She had held a succession of important government posts. She had been the first woman awarded the Medal of Freedom, highest civilian award for wartime overseas service. She was an outstanding authority on labor affairs and Social Security. In the field of man power—the work for which General Marshall had chosen her in this critical period of mobilization—she was the top expert in the country. Her intelligence, devotion, and probity were admired by leaders in virtually every field of endeavor. Mrs. Rosenberg had

been acclaimed by many as "the ablest woman in America."

But if Anna Rosenberg's appointment was received with high approval by the vast majority of Americans, it also caused other reactions. To some Americans, Mrs. Rosenberg's qualifications were overshadowed by what to them were three salient considerations: she was foreign-born; she had been a long-time friend of Franklin Roosevelt and now was a supporter of the Truman Fair Deal; and she was a Jew. Each of these facts acted as a magnet to draw together those seeking to destroy her.

It is both instructive and frightening to go behind the scenes and watch this wrecking crew at work in the case of Anna Rosenberg. It is instructive because the attempted smear of Anna Rosenberg was no isolated incident on the American scene, no temporary aberration. Anna Rosenberg was only one of many well-known public figures who have been so pilloried in recent years.

It is frightening because though in the end Mrs. Rosenberg herself was completely cleared, the fact is that the smear had achieved a status never before attained in this country. Never before had those seeking to damn an individual through irresponsible charges, innuendo, and guilt by association been able to win so respectful a hearing. Exploiting fear of Communism and the undeniable fact that Communists had been exposed in high places, troublemakers succeeded in creating such a climate of suspicion and distrust that proof of guilt no longer seemed necessary. The mere accusation of Communism could all but ruin a man's reputation, force him from his job, and lead others to flee association with him. Star-chamber hearings, the use of hearsay evidence, charges made by those determined to prove the Truman administration's alleged sympathy toward Communism—all these contributed to the general atmosphere of fear and hysteria in which the smear flourished.

It took one month, less a day, for the stage to be set for the ordeal of Anna Rosenberg.

Late in the afternoon of November 9, General Marshall first mentioned her name. The next evening, Fulton Lewis, Jr., the radio commentator, devoted his broadcast to Mrs. Rosenberg's background. He predicted that Republican Senators would demand of her "why some years ago she joined" the John Reed clubs, a Communist organization in New York. Lewis had obtained information about Mrs. Rosenberg from Dr. Joseph B. Matthews, former chief counsel for the Dies Committee (House Committee on Un-American Affairs), and a lecturer now earning his living by providing information about subversive or suspect persons and organizations.

The Senate Armed Services Committee, which had to pass on Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment, scheduled a routine hearing for November 29. But by that time Lewis's broadcast had taken effect; a private nine-page memorandum on Anna Rosenberg's "Red" background drawn routinely by Matthews for his organization had reached Senators and others.<sup>1</sup>

At the same time, professional bigots from coast to coast were in full cry. First among these was Gerald L. K. Smith, who alerted his "fellow Americans" to the fact that "Anna Rosenberg . . . one of the most ominous and enigmatic figures in the secret three-Jew machine—is now the complete boss of the program of mobilization of American manhood." Another was the Reverend Wesley Swift, a onetime Ku Klux Klan organizer and formerly Smith's chauffeur and bodyguard, who told his Los Angeles Anglo-Saxon Christian Congregation that Mrs. Rosenberg was not "only a Jewess but an alien from Budapest with Socialistic ideas . . . with a well-known anti-Christian and pro-Communist record."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Matthews prefaced his memorandum with a qualifying statement: "This memorandum neither states nor implies that Anna M. Rosenberg is a Communist or a Communist sympathizer." He asserted that a John Reed Club petition, published in the *New York Times* on May 19, 1930, had among its more than 100 signers the name of "Anna Rosenberg."

<sup>2</sup>The Reverend Mr. Swift for years has been treating his audiences to such state-

## 2 THE SMEAR

Shrillest of the hate press was *Common Sense*, a violent anti-Semitic weekly published in Union, New Jersey. In September 1950, its headlines had screamed: "Yiddish Marxists Plot USA Defeat By USSR." Now, thousands of copies of its November issue flooded Washington, and found their way into the mailboxes of newspaper and radio columnists, Senators, Representatives, and other Washington public figures. All four pages were devoted to a vitriolic attack on Mrs. Rosenberg, this "female Felix Frankfurter" who came from the heart of the "Eastern European Yiddish population" and whose record for years was replete, it claimed, with subversive, pro-Communist activity.

Before the month was over such varied personalities as Upton Close, the radio commentator, the Reverend Gerald Winrod, Edward James Smythe, the anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic pamphleteer, and others notorious as bigots were speaking, writing, or broadcasting the accusations.

When the thirteen-man Senate Armed Services Committee met on Wednesday, November 29, the results of this preliminary activity were evident. Nearly all the members had received letters or telegrams denouncing Mrs. Rosenberg as a socialist and a "collaborator with Communists," citing her alleged John Reed Club affiliation. A number came from one area in California. Senator Millard Tydings of Maryland, Committee chairman, observed wryly that "evidently there has been a little movement there."<sup>3</sup>

---

ments as "All Jews must be destroyed" and "I prophesy that before November 1953 there will not be a Jew in the United States, and by that I mean a Jew that will be able to walk or talk."

<sup>3</sup>The Reverend Wesley Swift was not the only instigator of trouble on the West Coast. Robert H. Williams, an anti-Semitic pamphleteer, was flooding California with copies of his monthly "Williams Intelligence Summary," which characterized Mrs. Rosenberg as "a long-time Communist fellow traveler." He described her—along with Assistant Secretary Marx Leva—as one of the "fast-thinking strategists favorable to Moscow," and added: "Rosenberg, Leva, and Frankfurter are Jewish, of course; and the power and influence of Jewish

Mrs. Rosenberg met the charges head on. Yes, she knew that Fulton Lewis, Jr., had stated she was a member of the John Reed Clubs. She knew that Matthews's memorandum stated she had been cited by the Dies Committee and had signed a John Reed Club petition. But she was not *that* Anna Rosenberg. In fact, she had asked Postmaster Goldman of New York how many Anna Rosenbergs lived in that city and he had told her there were forty-six of them.

"I did not know what the John Reed Clubs were, but I looked [them] up and they were Communist clubs," she told the Senate Committee. "The person who was cited was an Anna Rosenberg, not Anna M. Rosenberg . . . It was another Anna Rosenberg . . . I am not a socialist, never was; I am not a Communist sympathizer, and I never was; I am not a member and never have been of the John Reed Clubs."

She satisfied the Committee on this question; it voted unanimously the same afternoon to report her nomination favorably to the Senate. The Senate itself—which was now in recess—would act on the nomination as soon as it reconvened.

At this point, the wrecking crew began to consolidate forces. From behind the scenes emerged one Benjamin H. Freedman, a wealthy pro-Arab propagandist and financial angel to one of the nation's most notorious anti-Semitic newspapers. Freedman had a plan for blocking Mrs. Rosenberg's confirmation by the Senate. On Friday, December 1, he hurried to Washington to carry forward the program.

For the next few days the activities of Freedman and of the others who were involved in the smear are cloaked in secrecy; although, as we shall see, they emerge bit by bit, finally to fall into place like pieces in a nightmarish jigsaw puzzle.

---

generals continues to rise in the armed forces." He also inveighed against the treachery and trickery of the Jewish leadership of the world revolution and the "Jewish-dominated secret police." Williams defined Communism as "the domination of Whites by racial and social minorities under Jewish direction leading to the liquidation of Christianity."

On Tuesday, December 5, the Reverend Wesley Swift—the rabble-rouser who had been denouncing Mrs. Rosenberg on the West Coast—appeared in Washington and presented two memoranda to members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Both were signed by Benjamin H. Freedman. The Senate Committee, with Senator Richard Russell of Georgia as acting chairman in the absence of Senator Tydings, met in executive session to consider the two documents and voted to reopen the hearings on Mrs. Rosenberg on December 8.

What were these documents?

The first read:

Dr. J. B. Matthews, . . . West . . . Street, New York City, stated that to his knowledge there is a file in the FBI regarding Anna M. Rosenberg which contains information “to prove that Anna M. Rosenberg is the least desirable person in the entire United States to be appointed to that position.”

It is his opinion that the information contained in the FBI file on Anna M. Rosenberg will support all the allegations made regarding her connections, participations and/or relations with Communists, Communist-front, Communist transmission belt or pro-Communist organizations, and/or organizing movements.

The second document read in part:

Mr. Ralph De Sola, 52 West 84th Street, New York City, was a member of the Communist Party and his wife was also a member of the Communist Party at the same time . . . Ralph De Sola informed me on the morning of December 3, 1950, at his residence, that he had attended meetings of the John Reed Club held over a period of years in three clubrooms in the area of Sixth Avenue . . . Ralph De Sola stated to me that on numerous occasions he was present at the meetings of the John Reed Club when Anna M. Rosenberg, whose picture he identified in the newspapers as the person recently appointed as Assistant Secretary of Defense, was also present . . . At the same meeting . . . he informed me that Anna M. Rosenberg . . . had designated his wife (Mrs. Ralph De Sola) to work in the education field to plant Communist agents in the educational system in New York City . . .



When the Senate Committee voted to reopen the hearings, it also decided to call before it, among others, Ralph De Sola and Benjamin H. Freedman.

Ralph De Sola promptly appeared before the Committee on December 8. He had come down by train from New York that morning—a thin, slight man who had obviously felt his duty was unpleasant, but one that had to be done. Under questioning he was respectful, he was articulate, he was superbly confident of his facts. Yes, he was a former Communist; had been from September 1934 to September 1937. And Mrs. Rosenberg? He remembered her clearly. If he had any doubt, the pictures he had seen recently in the newspapers had dispelled it. Before he joined the Communist Party, he had been taken to his first John Reed Club meeting by James Magraw, whom he claimed was a Communist who had been trying to persuade him to join the Party. At that meeting, he said, Magraw—to show him that important people already belonged—pointed out Mrs. Rosenberg and said she was a member of the Communist Party.

“Later, this same Magraw asked me to forget about some of the people I had met at the John Reed Club and under what circumstances, and particularly people like Anna Rosenberg. And, he added, ‘You know why.’ Of course I knew why. She was getting to be a rather prominent person in the New Deal social welfare setup. It was obvious. She had to be protected. Other people had to be protected.”

De Sola indicated that he was not so naïve as to base his case simply upon the fact that he had seen Mrs. Rosenberg at a Communist meeting. It was her power and influence that dismayed him and led him to testify. “It was common knowledge around Communist Party headquarters that Anna Rosenberg could be depended on to see that Communists and fellow travelers and people sympathetic to the whole Soviet idea were given Government positions and were put in jobs that were important. . . . These things were fairly well understood

within the party headquarters and within the higher echelons of the Party, that a person who could be depended on, should be protected at all costs.

"Obviously, therefore, the Mrs. Anna Rosenberg is not forty other people or someone of that name that lives on Sixth Avenue . . ."

Nor had he seen Mrs. Rosenberg at that meeting only: he had seen her at several meetings thereafter.

All this, if true, was damning. The Committee members began to probe a little further. What had been De Sola's contacts with Mrs. Rosenberg at these meetings, Senator Russell asked.

"Just the contact I might have with any of you gentlemen in this room," De Sola promptly replied. "I am standing here talking to someone. I see someone over there." De Sola pointed. "I have been told that was Mrs. Rosenberg; and at a later date, after I was recruited, I was introduced to her. I chatted to her generally a few minutes about the wonderful growth of the Communist movement and success of the John Reed Club idea. That was the extent of my contact with her."

Was anyone else present during this conversation?

"James Magraw—the man who introduced me to her."

De Sola held firm under repeated grilling. Was he sure it was *the* Mrs. Rosenberg? How tall was she? How much did she weigh? What was the color of her complexion, her hair, the shape of her face? Had she spoken with an accent? Were there any moles, any distinguishing marks on her face?

De Sola replied patiently. If he could not be more precise in detail, it must be remembered this went back fifteen years or so, and it had been, after all, a casual meeting: he had not been "particularly impressed one way or the other . . . if the name hadn't been recalled to me as a name to forget, I probably would never have remembered it or never have associated it with the John Reed Club."

Before testifying, De Sola had submitted a typed statement containing his charges against Mrs. Rosenberg. Where had he prepared that statement? At the home of Mr. Benjamin H. Freedman.

When and how had he first met Mr. Freedman?

He had met him about two weeks ago. "I met him over the telephone," De Sola explained. "A friend of mine called me and said—not even a friend, an acquaintance of short duration: 'I would like you to talk to a friend of mine called Ben Freedman . . . here is his number.'"

The man who had telephoned him was a Mr. Hallam Richardson.

Who was Mr. Richardson? De Sola was a little embarrassed. Richardson, he said, was an attorney who had once visited him when he—De Sola—was circulation manager of *Freeman* magazine. De Sola said he later learned that Richardson was an "anti-Semite" who was associated with Joe McWilliams.

Senator Kefauver: "Is that the same Joe McWilliams who is the famous anti-Semitic street-corner orator?"

"I am assuming it was," De Sola replied, with the care of a man who would not wish to be guilty of slandering anyone. "The damaging thing was that I was told Mr. Richardson had written a foreword of some pamphlet of Mr. McWilliams, and I decided I could have nothing further to do with that type—"

Senator Kefauver: "McWilliams was connected with the German-American Bund?"

De Sola nodded. "Yes."

Had Richardson explained why he wanted De Sola to speak with Ben Freedman, Senator Lyndon Johnson asked.

"I think he said—in fact, I'm pretty sure he said—it was something about Anna Rosenberg—interested in Anna Rosenberg, wanted to know what you know. I said, 'What I know isn't very much. It is very long ago.' He said, 'In the general arch we are building it may be a keystone.' I said, 'I hardly think so.'"

Very well. De Sola spoke with Freedman. What had Freedman wanted to know? Freedman wanted to know about Mrs. Rosenberg and her activities at the John Reed Club. "I saw he was a person who was responsible and interested in the same thing I was interested in, in getting this thing straightened out as fast as possible, and I talked to him about it. I went over to his home and sat down at his typewriter and typed [the] statement."

Had De Sola discussed what he knew about Mrs. Rosenberg with anyone other than Mr. Freedman, Senator Russell asked.

"Yes, I certainly did," said De Sola. Shortly after seeing Freedman, he had discussed it with two investigators for this very committee now questioning him. They came to his home early one morning, he said, and asked him all about Mrs. Rosenberg. He couldn't remember their names, but one of the men gave him Benjamin H. Freedman's calling card as an introduction.

There was a moment of astonished silence. The Senate Armed Services Committee had sent no investigators to Mr. De Sola's home.

Senator Russell: "Did [this man] tell you he was an investigator for this committee?"

"Yes, sir. He said he was an investigator for the Armed Services Committee of the Senate of the United States."

"And you don't recall his name?"

"He came with a Mr. Nellor."

"Who is Mr. Nellor?"

De Sola shook his head. "I assumed he was also a member of your group."

"Just give us a brief description of these two gentlemen," suggested Senator Russell. The man who said he was the investigator—a "Mr. Cerine," De Sola now believed his name to be—was a rather florid-faced young man, "blond to reddish hair, rather wavy—not wavy, sort of stuck up in little tight curls on

his head." He weighed "about 175 pounds, was smooth-shaven, no eyeglasses."

Had the two men shown him any credentials?

Only Mr. Freedman's calling card, De Sola said. Then he remembered that Freedman had telephoned him before the mysterious visitors arrived, to say that he was sending them over; Freedman had also written on the back of his card, "These are the gentlemen I spoke about."

Had Freedman told De Sola who the men were?

"No," said De Sola, then amended his reply. "Well, he gave me the impression, put it this way, that these were men from the Armed Services Committee who were running this thing down and he would appreciate any co-operation with them . . ."

De Sola grew still more vague when Senator Gurney pressed him a few minutes later: "These two men said they represented this Committee, or at least you had that impression?"

Well, said De Sola, "They didn't say. One of them said—I felt that he said or he gave me the impression—I don't want to put him on the spot if he was an agent for one of the Senators acting on behalf of this Committee—but I did get the impression it was for the Armed Services Committee."

An agent for one of the Senators? Which Senator? Gurney demanded.

"One of them, I think—he stated he was from Senator McCarthy's office; that when I came down here, that is where I could leave my things and any messages that were coming for me. And that is what I did, at Room 245, Senator McCarthy's office," replied De Sola. When he arrived in Washington, he had gone to Senator McCarthy's office, left his coat there, and from there had come in to be questioned by the Committee.

This was interesting information. Senator McCarthy was not a member of the Armed Services Committee.

"Did anyone help you out on your expense coming down here?" Senator Gurney asked.

"No, sir," said De Sola. Benjamin Freedman had picked up his train ticket for him; but he, himself, had paid for the ticket.

He testified further that he had never told Freedman—as Freedman had declared in his own memorandum—that Anna Rosenberg had assigned Mrs. De Sola to plant Communists in the New York schools. And before he concluded his testimony, De Sola told the Committee that shortly after quitting the Communist Party in 1937, he had given all his information on Anna Rosenberg to a "special investigator" of the FBI—George Starr, now retired.

The Committee called in Mrs. Rosenberg that same afternoon.

"Mrs. Rosenberg," Senator Russell said to her, "the witness Ralph De Sola has undertaken to testify positively to the fact that he knew you, had met you, and seen you at a meeting of the John Reed Club."

"He is a liar," declared Mrs. Rosenberg. "I would like to lay my hands on that man. It is inhuman what he has done to me in the past few days, and I am grateful to you people for the time you have spent. . . . Now, if this man is crazy or a Communist, I want to face him, Senator. I have never been a member of the John Reed Club; I have never been a Communist; I have never sympathized with Communists; I have spent my life trying to do something to help my country."

"I tried to think—where do I know this man? How do I know him from some place? How can a human being do this to someone? What can he have against me? I don't know him. . . . Please let me face this man. . . . I plead with you, finish this. If you don't think I am fit to take this office, say so. I don't care what you charge me with, but not disloyalty, Senator. It is an awful thing to carry around with you."

Senator Russell: "No member of this committee has charged you with disloyalty, Mrs. Rosenberg."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "I know, Senator. Please forgive me . . . I

don't usually get emotional, and I appreciate what you are doing. Forget what I said."

Senator Russell: "Yes. Well, then, I suppose that the next order of business would be to bring this man De Sola in."

De Sola walked into the room.

"Mr. De Sola," began Russell, "you are aware of the fact, of course, that you are still a witness before the committee and under oath. I would like to ask you if you know the lady who is sitting on my right."

De Sola: "Yes, that is Mrs. Anna Rosenberg."

Senator Russell: "Will you identify her as the same Anna Rosenberg about whom you testified today?"

De Sola: "I do."

Not only did he cling to his identification, he then made a fervent appeal to Mrs. Rosenberg: "For your own sake, and for the sake of our country, for the sake of clearing up the possibility that there may be misidentification in my mind and that there may be somebody that looks so exactly like you that I might have made a mistake, or that I might be in some way doing something that is harmful to you personally or to a much larger issue, to the security of our country and the defense of our country, will you please tell us or tell me or tell the investigators of this committee where they can find that [other] Mrs. Rosenberg, so that I could look at her?"

"Mr. De Sola," said Mrs. Rosenberg, "There are several Anna Rosenbergs in New York. I don't know them. I have not seen them. But the office records, the telephone book, show that there are several Anna Rosenbergs. It is up to you to have looked at them before you make such a serious accusation against me."

De Sola: "I hear it said that you know that one of them is a writer and that this is the Anna Rosenberg that people are talking about. If you know her, can't you produce her or can't you help this group here?"

Mrs. Rosenberg: "Mr. De Sola, I read the Dies Committee report, and the Anna Rosenberg was a writer. I am not a writer. The Anna Rosenberg signed herself as Anna Rosenberg; I have always signed myself as Anna M. Rosenberg. I have never written anything, never been a member of any writers club, and no one knows better than you."

De Sola: "Pardon me, Mrs. Rosenberg. I am not saying that you were a member of any writers club. The John Reed Club was a revolutionary club; it was not a writers club. There were artists, writers, professionals, and all sorts of people there."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "You are an expert on that; I am not, Mr. De Sola. I will take your word as to what it was."

De Sola: "And on the writers project I didn't say you were there, and I never mentioned you to the Dies Committee as being the Anna Rosenberg that I knew or that had signed anything."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "Why didn't you, Mr. De Sola? It was your duty to do it. Why didn't you mention it?"

De Sola: "I mentioned you to the FBI and I mentioned a lot of other people to the FBI and to this day I can't force them to make an investigation of any of these things. These things have to come as they have to come."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "May I ask a question?"

De Sola: "This is a very painful duty and a very embarrassing sort of thing to have to come to here."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "Mr. De Sola, where and when did you see me in the John Reed Clubs?"

De Sola: "At the various meetings that they had in the summer, the late summer and the fall of 1934 and 1935. They were along Sixth Avenue between Eighth Street and Fourteenth Street. The last time was in the Civic Repertory Theater rehearsal room on the second floor."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "And I spoke to you?"



De Sola: "Yes, you spoke about the growth of the John Reed Club and what an excellent device it had been for a sounding board for Communist propaganda and as a recruiting ground."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "Mr. De Sola, I don't believe that any human being wants to do what you are doing purposely. Please come and look at me carefully and see whether you know me from my pictures or you actually know me. You came into the room and you said, 'that is the woman.' You never looked at me. Do you know what you are doing to me?"

De Sola: "I am looking at you and I am looking at you now."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "And I am the woman that you sat next to or talked to in the John Reed Clubs?"

De Sola: "We stood up when we talked. Would you mind standing up?"

Mrs. Rosenberg: "I will stand up. Now, tell me, am I the woman in the John Reed Clubs?"

De Sola: "Yes, Ma'am; you are, I am sorry to say so."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "And all these years you never found that out and you never told it to the Dies Committee? What made you tell it now, please tell me?"

De Sola: "Because I am sorry to see that we have a Secretary of Defense who has to be assisted by a Communist. I am sorry for our country. If you had been put in a social security agency where it was just a question of some kind of social work, social welfare work, I could have said cynically to myself, 'Well, these people get there anyway and she can't do too much harm' and the defense agency is—"

Senator Russell: "Just a moment. We will proceed in an orderly way."

Mrs. Rosenberg: "I have no questions to ask this man. I would like to get on the record, Mr. Chairman, that I have never seen this man in my life. Now, if he attended any meeting with me, I have no recollection of ever seeing his face."

Thus it stood over the week end. A pattern was developing, but it was far from clear.

Who were the two investigators, and for whom were they acting?

What part had Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in all this?

What was the full role played by Benjamin H. Freedman? By the Reverend Wesley Swift, who gave Freedman's statements to the Senators? By Fulton Lewis, Jr., who first broadcast the charges? By J. B. Matthews, who supplied Fulton Lewis Jr., with a memorandum on Mrs. Rosenberg's "background"? By others not yet mentioned?

And finally, what had Hallam Richardson meant by "the general arch we are building"—and who were the "we" who were building it?

Slowly the answers began to come to light when the Senate Committee resumed its hearings of witnesses on Monday, December 11. The first witness was Dr. J. B. Matthews, precise, professorial, who was asked if he had told Freedman that an FBI file contained information "to prove that Anna M. Rosenberg is the least desirable person in the entire United States to be appointed" Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Matthews exploded indignantly. "I have never made any such statement in my life," he swore. "I have never had any such thought and therefore could not have made the statement!" Freedman had already written him a letter of abject apology for misquoting him. What he, Matthews, had told Freedman was: "I happen to know some things that have been put in the file of the FBI." He had in mind that one William Harris, a former FBI agent, "had reported to the FBI that he [Harris] had been in a Communist Party cell with Mrs. Anna Rosenberg."

Did Matthews know Harris? No. Did Matthews know that Harris had made such a statement? No, said Matthews, but he had been told so by a former FBI man who had been Harris's

superior—a man named Ted Kirkpatrick, now one of the publishers of *Counterattack*, a “news service on Communists.” As to whether the Anna Rosenberg who had signed the John Reed Club petition was *the* Anna M. Rosenberg—as to whether the Communist Anna Rosenberg was *the* Anna M. Rosenberg—Matthews emphatically declared to the Committee that he himself was “wholly incompetent” to determine.

And as to Mr. Benjamin H. Freedman, Matthews hurried to add that for the past five years he had done his best “not to have any associations” with him, because he considered Mr. Freedman “rabidly anti-Semitic.” He based this “on some occasional reading of the material that comes out in a magazine he [Mr. Freedman] supports, a paper known as *Common Sense*.”

By the time Matthews left the stand, the Committee had decided to call in both Harris and Kirkpatrick; James McGraw, who De Sola, misspelling the name as Magraw, said was the ex-Communist who introduced him to Mrs. Rosenberg at the John Reed Club; George J. Starr, the retired FBI agent whom De Sola said he had told all about Mrs. Rosenberg; and Benjamin H. Freedman.

When Freedman, the first of these witnesses, appeared the Senate Committee saw before it a sleek, well-groomed gentleman, whose conservative dress, pince-nez, and general self-possession might have type-cast him as a successful banker. But the Committee already had in its hands information which suggested that here was a highly irresponsible and even bizarre personality.

As a witness, Freedman was difficult to pin down—and as hard to follow. His memory played him tricks; he replied yes and no to the same question; and he went off on such rambling and chaotic answers that frequently the senators found they had all but lost their original questions.

When had he first met Ralph De Sola? On a Sunday morning a few weeks ago.

"How did you know him?" Senator Kefauver asked. Freedman explained there had been a telephone call.

Kefauver: "Whom did you telephone to?"

Freedman: "I will explain that. That afternoon I had been talking to a lawyer who represented me in several of those libel suits I had to bring against the Anti-Defamation League and its various——"

Kefauver: "Who was that lawyer?"

Freedman: "I will mention—that was Hallam Richardson."

Kefauver: "Was that the fellow associated with McWilliams?"

Freedman: "I hear that, but I don't know anything about that."

Kefauver: "Richardson is your lawyer and has been for some time?"

Freedman: "He only represented me after these smears started, an advertising agency introduced me to him and said he knows libel law . . . So I asked him whether he would handle one of these cases. I don't know what the Anti-Defamation League called me that day, but they found something——"

Kefauver: "Anyway, you were talking on the telephone with Mr.——"

Freedman: "Richardson."

Kefauver: "Is that where you learned about Mr. De Sola?"

Freedman: "No, not on the telephone. I hadn't seen much of him since this Palestine business is out of the papers, and since the Anti-Defamation League and its subsidiaries have stopped libeling me, but there are about five or six libel suits still pending.<sup>4</sup> So I call him up once in a while and ask him——"

Kefauver: "My question was: how did you first get in touch with Mr. De Sola?"

<sup>4</sup>Despite these sworn statements, to the time of publication of this book, no legal action has been instituted by Freedman against the Anti-Defamation League.

Freedman: "So I called him [Richardson] up that Saturday and I said: 'What are you doing?' He said, 'Nothing.' I said: 'Come around to the house,' and he said, 'All right,' and he was to the house, and I said, 'Stay for dinner,' and he stayed for dinner and he is a very nice fellow. I don't know anything about his other clients. So I explained this Anna Rosenberg situation and he said, 'Say, I think I can find out about that, whether she was ever a member of the John Reed Club, because I knew she was a member of the John Reed Club and cited by the Un-American—or, yes, the Un-American Activities Committee.'"

Kefauver: "You knew that?"

Freedman: "Yes."

Kefauver: "How did you know that?"

Freedman: "Well, I really think I found that out when I telephoned—telephone call—all the things happened in such a rush."

Kefauver: "You said you knew it. Tell us how you found it out."

Freedman: "I think when I telephoned to Mr. McGinley<sup>5</sup> at *Common Sense* and asked him, I think that is, I believe that is——"

Kefauver: "You are swearing under oath—do you swear on oath that Mrs. Rosenberg was cited by the Un-American Activities Committee?"

Freedman: "I don't know what 'cited' really means."

Kefauver: "That is just what you said . . ."

Freedman: "That Anna Rosenberg's name is in Volume I and II [of the Dies Committee Report]. I assumed it was the Anna Rosenberg, I assumed that."

Kefauver sought to pin Freedman down: "Is that your testimony? You said a few minutes ago under oath that Anna Rosenberg was cited by the Un-American Activities Committee——"

Freedman: "I withdraw that."

<sup>5</sup>Conde McGinley of Union, New Jersey, publisher of *Common Sense*.

Kefauver: "Wait a minute—as a member of the John Reed Club. Is that your testimony?"

Freedman: "No."

Kefauver: "What did you say that for?"

Freedman: "I really shouldn't have said——"

Kefauver: "Why tell us one thing and then turn around?"

In later testimony Freedman was asked further questions about his telephone call to Conde McGinley. He remembered now that the purpose of his call was to learn if McGinley might not have material on Anna Rosenberg.

Senator Johnson asked: "Have you bought any copies of *Common Sense*?"

Freedman said no.

Has he sent any through the mails?

Freedman said yes. "I paid for fifty thousand of them and I mailed out about twenty-five thousand."

Which issue was that? The November issue, said Freedman, devoted to Anna Rosenberg. And he admitted that he had made occasional contributions to *Common Sense*, spending in all nearly \$20,000 to support it.

Why, actually, had he made his written accusations against Mrs. Rosenberg?

"Well, to be frank with you, I did it to establish sufficient interest so that I might be questioned. That was all . . . All I thought as a layman was, well, certain information came to me, some of it is hearsay and some of it I had looked up, and I said with what is going on and what you read in the papers, with Alger Hiss and Judith Coplon and Lee Pressmen and John Abt and Charles Kramer, and all those older people who were regarded as men of highest caliber . . . I just thought I would bring it to the attention of somebody, and they could do whatever they saw fit. I didn't know."

Senator Cain asked: "What did you personally know about

Anna M. Rosenberg before the announcement of her appointment by the Executive?"

Freedman: "Well, in 1934, I think it was, somebody asked me to give some time to the NRA. It was on a volunteer basis, and I was appointed assistant director of complaints."

Senator Cain: "Is that saying, Mr. Freedman, that during a period of some twelve years, that is all you ever knew personally about Anna M. Rosenberg, and all you knew then was an extremely casual——"

Freedman: "Correct."

Senator Cain: "——acquaintance or association with her?"

Freedman: "That is correct. That is all I know about her personally; that is all I know."

Senator Cain: "With reference to your statement, which is an important statement, Mr. Freedman, is there a single charge or allegation in that statement about Anna M. Rosenberg which you personally know to be a fact? Is there anything in your statement at all which you know to be so?"

Freedman: "Personally, you mean that I—I have heard it."

Senator Cain: "No, no; that is hearsay. In this statement various things about Anna M. Rosenberg are said . . . That she put Communists into the school system of New York; that she was a member of the John Reed Clubs; that she was this, that and the other thing. Do you know a single solitary word of your statement, which is but a reflection, as I see it, of stories gotten by you from two people, to be the truth?"

Freedman: "Correct, that is correct."

In the course of the next few minutes Freedman backtracked rapidly. If Matthews had denied telling him there was a file in the FBI proving that Anna M. Rosenberg was the least desirable person in the United States to be appointed Assistant Secretary of Defense, he, Freedman, would withdraw that accusation. And if Ralph De Sola, too, had denied telling him that Mrs. Rosenberg had ordered Mrs. De Sola to place Com-

munists in the New York school system, he, Freedman, would also withdraw that accusation.

Now, then, what about the two investigators Freedman had sent to De Sola with his calling card?

Well, said Freedman, they came to his home about midnight and wanted to know all about Anna Rosenberg.

Senator Russell: "Why did they think that you were a source of information on Mrs. Rosenberg. Did they say?"

Freedman: "They didn't say. They may have—"

Senator Russell: "You do not remember about that?"

Freedman: "Well, it was around twelve o'clock at night, and one of them said he represents a Senator or something . . ."

Senator Russell: "You did not ask them any questions about—people coming to your home at twelve o'clock at night, you did not ask them what their business was or who they represented?"

Freedman: "No. Somebody telephoned me from Washington and said, 'Two men are coming up to see you about Rosenberg.'"

Who was the person who telephoned from Washington? A "Mr. Smith," said Freedman. Did he know Mr. Smith? Yes, he had met him. What was Mr. Smith's business? Freedman really didn't know. Where had he seen Mr. Smith first? He had seen him in Washington a day or two before the two men visited his home. How long had he known Mr. Smith? Mr. Smith had once telephoned him about five years ago. And he didn't know Mr. Smith's business?

"Well," said Freedman, apparently deciding to make a clean breast of it, "I think he is in the publishing business. He is—it is this Gerald Smith."

Senator Russell: "Gerald L. K. Smith?"

Yes, said Freedman, but he repeated again that he knew nothing about Mr. Smith.

Was it possible that Mr. Smith had telephoned Mr. Freedman the same evening the two investigators visited him?"



Freedman's memory began to improve. Yes, Smith had telephoned him about five or six o'clock the same day, telling him, "There are two men on the way to New York to see you."

Senator Russell: "Did he ask you to see them and co-operate with them?"

Freedman: "No. I don't let him tell me anything."

Senator Russell: "What is that?"

Freedman: "No. Why—he didn't tell me anything of the kind."

Senator Russell: "Did you tell Mr. De Sola that these two men were representing the Senate Armed Services Committee?"

Freedman didn't think he had. "I may have said they are investigating, and probably the Senate Armed Services Committee is looking into this, otherwise how could these two fellows come to New York. I didn't tell them—the Armed Services Committee—that I knew it from their credentials, and I don't recall having told them that, Senator. I wrote on a card, 'These men look all right,' or something like that. I gave them a card, whatever was written on it. If I said on the card, 'They look like Armed Services,' whatever I wrote on that card—." Freedman paused, and brightened momentarily. "You must remember it was half-past twelve or one o'clock at night."

Senator Russell: "But you had not gone to sleep, so you were not—"

Freedman: "I never go to bed before one or two o'clock."

Senator Russell: "So you were wide-awake?"

Freedman: "Yes."

Had Freedman any idea that the two men were representing Gerald L. K. Smith?

Freedman: "No. If I thought they were representing him, I would not see anybody—"

Senator Russell: "Well, you just testified that he was the man who called you about it."

Freedman: "Yes, but he just said—I thought he found it out—"

he told me that there were two men on the way to New York to see me."

Senator Russell: "How would he have been interested in your seeing these two men if you had not told him that you would be interested in seeing them, as Mr. Smith talked to you; I confess that it is slightly confusing."

Confusing was the word for it. Senator Knowland tried. Freedman had said that Smith called him. Could Freedman swear that it was the so-called Gerald L. K. Smith, or could it have been some other Mr. Smith?

No, he couldn't swear, said Freedman. The man gave no name, but Freedman thought he recognized the voice.

Senator Knowland: "You mean this voice came over the telephone and said, 'Mr. Freedman, there are a couple of men coming up to see you?'"

Well, said Freedman unhappily, getting entangled still deeper in his own web, he had met this Gerald L. K. Smith "here in Washington. I had lunch with him here in the Senate or House restaurant."

Had Freedman seen either of the two mysterious investigators—Nellor and Surine—since that midnight meeting at his home?

Freedman: ". . . When Mr. De Sola and I came over on the train together we went to Senator McCarthy's office where he was told to go, I think."

Senator Russell: "Told by whom?"

Freedman: "I don't know, but he said, 'Come on. I am going over to Senator McCarthy's office,'—and there I heard the name Surine."

Who mentioned the name Surine? Freedman wasn't sure. It might have been De Sola. Then again it might have been a girl in Senator McCarthy's office.

Senator Gurney took up the subject of Freedman's original

written accusation against Mrs. Rosenberg. He had evidently dictated it in Washington? Yes. Where? and to whom?

Freedman: "I dictated it to a stenographer of a congressman."

Which congressman? In the office of which congressman had he dictated it, demanded Senator Gurney.

Uncomfortable as Freedman had been until now, he was extremely ill at ease at this moment. "Well, may I—is it—I hate to involve people unnecessarily. Is it necessary for me to tell you the congressman?" The Committee thought it was necessary.

There was no way out. "All right," said Freedman. "Congressman Rankin."

Senator Gurney: "Those are all the questions I have."

In the next few days the case against Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg collapsed like a punctured balloon. Mrs. Helen Winner, ex-wife of Ralph De Sola, came to the Committee to deny categorically that she knew Mrs. Rosenberg as a Communist or as a member of the John Reed Clubs. Asked about her former husband and the father of her children, Mrs. Winner was understandably reticent. "He is a truthful person," she testified, "with some limitations . . . it is an awfully difficult thing to explain."

Senator Hunt picked up this line of questioning and asked whether De Sola was of "good, sound mind." Mrs. Winner insisted on answering off the record. (She had not gone off the record to praise her ex-husband.) The picture the Senators then got of De Sola was that of an unstable, frustrated writer who resented the fact that he had to earn his living in jobs he considered demeaning; a man who could persuade himself to believe passionately in that which he wanted—or needed—to believe in. The Senators were obviously impressed by her reluctant and careful testimony.

James McGraw, who De Sola swore was the ex-Communist who introduced him to Mrs. Rosenberg at the John Reed Clubs, appeared before the Committee. Indignant and outraged, in no

uncertain terms he declared he was not a former Communist, not a former member of the John Reed Clubs, had never seen Anna Rosenberg at a John Reed Club, and had certainly never introduced Ralph De Sola to Anna M. Rosenberg at a John Reed Club. As for Ralph De Sola, Mr. McGraw had his own opinion about him, and it was not high.

Then William Harris testified. He had never been an FBI agent; he had never told Ted Kirkpatrick, publisher of *Counter-attack*, of any alleged Communist affiliations of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg. He had never said he was in a Communist cell with Mrs. Rosenberg. He did not know Mrs. Rosenberg.

Then Ted Kirkpatrick testified. No, Harris had not told him that Anna M. Rosenberg had been associated with Communists. What had happened was this. J. B. Matthews had telephoned him about two weeks before, asking if he had any data on Mrs. Rosenberg that Matthews might not have. Kirkpatrick vaguely recalled that Anna Rosenberg's name had come up "in a discussion with a man who had at one time been affiliated with the Abraham Lincoln Brigade." Since William Harris had once been a member of the Brigade, Kirkpatrick had suggested that someone might contact Harris and see what he knew. But he, Kirkpatrick, had never told Matthews that Harris told him that he had been in a Communist Party cell with Anna Rosenberg.

Then George J. Starr, the retired FBI agent to whom De Sola said he had told everything about Anna M. Rosenberg, testified. He denied that De Sola had told him anything of the sort. And finally, the FBI produced the Anna Rosenberg who had been confused with Anna M. Rosenberg—and most bizarre of all, it developed that this Anna Rosenberg had left the John Reed Clubs and had gone to live in California before De Sola became a member, so that De Sola could not even plead a case of mistaken identity!

Then one of the two mysterious "investigators"—the man named Nellor—testified. He turned out to be Edward K. Nellor

of Washington, D.C. His business? He was a reporter for Fulton Lewis, Jr., the radio commentator. Yes, he had flown to New York with Donald Surine, an employee of Senator Joseph McCarthy. He had been assigned by Lewis to learn from De Sola all he could about Mrs. Rosenberg. He and Surine had gone directly to Freedman because Surine said De Sola was frightened and could only be reached through Freedman. They had not posed as investigators for the Committee. Freedman certainly couldn't have been ignorant as to their identity; in fact, Surine had telephoned Freedman from Washington just before they took the plane, saying they were coming down to see him. And De Sola, too, couldn't have been ignorant as to their identity. Nellor himself had told De Sola that he was from Fulton Lewis's office; and Surine had repeatedly told De Sola that he, in turn, was from Senator McCarthy's office. And when De Sola came to Washington to testify, "he came direct to Senator McCarthy's office and asked for Surine."

Why should Gerald Smith have known they were on their way to New York, and why should Smith have telephoned Ben Freedman to that effect? Nellor didn't know; Surine had told Nellor on the plane to New York that "Gerald L. K. Smith had been running around the Senate Office Building with a copy of Freedman's statement regarding De Sola . . ."

How, actually, had this fantastic smear been engineered?

Here is how the pieces in the jigsaw puzzle fit together.

Let us go back to the November 10 broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., which first made public the charges against Mrs. Rosenberg. From that point on, Lewis worked energetically to develop evidence against Mrs. Rosenberg. (Later, night after night, he gave his listeners his own account of the closed-door testimony against Mrs. Rosenberg, ending with a solemn reminder that hanging over the case was the cloud of the Alger Hiss-Whittaker Chambers duel.) Also interested in Mrs. Rosen-

berg was Senator Joseph McCarthy, zealously searching for information useful in his continuing exposé of alleged Communists in the Administration. After Mrs. Rosenberg's name had been first mentioned by General Marshall—a man whom McCarthy, in effect, has called a traitor to the United States—McCarthy let New York and Chicago friends know of his interest in this matter. It was natural that Nellor, Fulton Lewis's aide, and Surine, McCarthy's aide, should collaborate in the investigation. These two assistants were the men who found De Sola in New York City through Freedman, and who brought his story back to their principals in Washington.

For a long time Senator McCarthy had been leaning heavily on J. B. Matthews as a source of information on Communists. Fulton Lewis sought help occasionally. On November 27, Matthews wrote the following letter to C. Russell Turner, Lewis's assistant. It should be read while keeping in mind Matthews's indignant statement, made under oath to the Senate Committee some days later, that he was "wholly incompetent" to determine whether the "Red" Anna Rosenberg and Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg were the same person. The letter reads:

Nov. 27, 1950

Dear Russ:

Here are the photostats, together with a memorandum on the Communist organizations with which A.R. has, according to public records, been affiliated.

On the question of whether or not the A.R. of these documents is *the* A.R., I can report that there is not the slightest doubt. I have made exhaustive inquiries and investigations, as a result of which I have established beyond any possibility of dispute that there had been *only one* Anna Rosenberg sufficiently known in public life to be listed with the well-known names in these documents, and that there has not been any other Anna Rosenberg of comparable fame, stature, notoriety, or what have you during the past twenty-five years. One of my sources is a Jewish organization *which knows about these things*.

Ben Mandel of the House Un-American Committee tells me that

he told you Anna Rosenberg is a name like John Smith. My comment to that is "nuts!"

Furthermore, in the files of the FBI there is a report on Anna Rosenberg which is literally startling, but of course, I could not substantiate it.

Yours,  
J.B.

The calendar of events unfolds:

*Friday, December 1:* Benjamin H. Freedman came to Washington. Both Gerald Smith and the Reverend Wesley Swift were there. Smith had arrived with a staff of three persons to see what he could do to block Mrs. Rosenberg's nomination. Swift, for his part, had spent several days warning Congressmen that Mrs. Rosenberg was an overwhelming menace to the United States; he said he had Dies Committee data on her, and even if she were not a Communist, the fact that she was a Jewess<sup>e</sup> should prohibit the United States from placing *her* in a position of importance. Freedman called upon Congressman Rankin and later upon Gerald Smith at the Congressional Hotel, where the two of them lunched together and talked over what strategy should be used against Mrs. Rosenberg. Smith suggested to Freedman that he not rely solely upon the John Reed Club story. But that he return to New York and there talk with Dr. J. B. Matthews who would be in a position to furnish additional information about Mrs. Rosenberg.

*Saturday, December 2, and Sunday, December 3:* Freedman,

<sup>e</sup>Ten days later, Swift reported to a meeting of his Anglo-Israel Bible Class at 940 S. Figueroa St., Los Angeles, that among those he had seen on the Rosenberg case was "the courageous South Mississippi Congressman John Rankin. The first two hours I talked with him, he started to preach about the enemies of Christ in America. He said, 'There hasn't been a good one [Jew] since the days of Jesus Christ.' I replied, 'Jesus Christ was not a Jew. Nor were his disciples Jews, with one exception.'" That exception, said Swift, was Judas. "Half an hour later Congressman Rankin called Senator —, saying, 'Jesus Christ was not a Jew.' I ran into that all over the capital . . . that Christ was not a Jew and His disciples (or eleven of them) were not Jews—so they could expect the same sort of thing from modern 'Judases.'"

back in New York, talked with Hallam Richardson. He then "discovered" Ralph De Sola—the one man in the United States who was prepared to testify that Anna Rosenberg was a Communist. Gerald Smith had sent Freedman to New York practically empty-handed, and within twenty-four hours Freedman was prepared to deliver the goods.

*Monday, December 4:* Freedman, now back in Washington, called upon Congressman Ed Gossett of Texas (since resigned), who like Rankin is not unknown in anti-Semitic circles. Gossett, prepared to help in a cause which appealed to him, took Freedman to Senator Russell, acting chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. To Freedman's dire warnings and urgent request that the Rosenberg case be reopened, Russell said that unless a written affidavit, to which someone would attest, was submitted, he would not vote to reopen the hearings. Meanwhile, Swift, having conferred with Rankin and Smith, visited McCarthy's office. Then George Wilson, assistant to Senator Knowland, a member of the Committee, took Swift to see Colonel Mark Galusha, the Committee's staff director. Swift told Galusha that (1) he had evidence proving that Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, despite her denials, *was* the Communist Mrs. Rosenberg, and (2) he had already given his evidence to Senator McCarthy, who was also working on the case.

Colonel Galusha was also aware of Congressman Rankin's activity in the case. On that very day Rankin stood on the floor of the House and, parroting phrases from Freedman's charges, denounced Mrs. Rosenberg. He declared: "Witnesses now living, I understand, will testify that this [the "Red" Mrs. Rosenberg] is the same Anna Rosenberg who has been appointed to this important position with our Department of National Defense . . . Mr. Speaker, while our boys are dying by the thousands in foreign fields, I submit it is no time to put any questionable character, especially a foreign-born character, in a position of this importance."



Colonel Galusha reported to Senators Russell and Byrd, the two ranking members of the Committee, what Swift had told him. The two Senators decided that, in view of Senator McCarthy's interest, if the charges, no matter how preposterous, were reduced to writing, they would be obliged to bring them to the Committee's attention.

Colonel Galusha carried this message to Swift. Swift suggested that such a written statement could be produced, and asked Galusha if he could use his telephone. "I'll make the call for you," said Galusha, and noted on his pad, as he asked the operator for it, "Congressional Hotel, Room 405." (This was the room of Gerald L. K. Smith.) Swift took the telephone, spoke to an unidentified person there, hung up, and, turning to Galusha, told him the charges would be submitted in writing the following day. That afternoon Freedman and Smith went to Congressman Rankin's office, where they concocted two statements of charges against Mrs. Rosenberg. Freedman signed both.

*Tuesday, December 5:* The Reverend Wesley Swift, as he promised, submitted Freedman's written charges against Mrs. Rosenberg, signed by Benjamin H. Freedman, to the Senate Committee. The Committee met in executive session, voted to reopen the hearings, and to subpoena, as witnesses, Freedman, De Sola, the latter's ex-wife, and others. Galusha was to notify the two men to come to Washington and testify; but to get their telephone numbers he had to contact Swift. Galusha, however, had no number for Swift, either. Then he recalled the "Room 405, Congressional Hotel" notation he had made on his pad. Perhaps someone there would know how to reach Swift. He called that room. A man whom he does not know, but believes to have been Gerald Smith, answered the telephone and promptly gave him Freedman's unlisted telephone number in New York. Galusha telephoned Freedman, who agreed to appear as a witness. He gave De Sola's number to Galusha, but

urged him not to call the ex-Mrs. De Sola "because she'd only make trouble for us."

Now another name popped up in the Rosenberg smear—Representative Clare Hoffman. Adding his voice to the growing clamor, Hoffman attacked Mrs. Rosenberg in the House, quoting in full from a circular Smith had distributed in Washington in the name of Smith's American Anti-Communist League; interestingly enough, the language was identical with that of Freedman's written accusation. It asserted that a file in the headquarters of the FBI would establish that "Anna M. Rosenberg is the least desirable person in the United States to hold such a position."

*Tuesday, December 5; Evening:* Nellor and Surine—the first from Fulton Lewis's office, the second from Senator McCarthy's—flew to New York to see Freedman and later De Sola. Surine carried with him a sealed envelope addressed to Freedman, which later turned out to contain a letter from Gerald Smith to Benjamin Freedman.<sup>7</sup> According to Drew Pearson, it reads:

Tuesday afternoon

Dear Mr. Freedman:

Congratulations on the terrific job you are doing in helping to keep the Zionist Jew Anna M. Rosenberg from becoming the dictator of the Pentagon. This is to introduce two gentlemen who are helping in this fight. One is the bearer of this note. I understand that he is Mr. Nellor, the chief aide to Mr. Fulton Lewis. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Nellor should be treated very kindly. You should give them any information that will help them, because Mr. Lewis is doing a magnificent job in the Rosenberg matter.

Please destroy this upon reading it.

Sincerely yours,  
Gerald L. K.

GLKS:L

P.S. The bearer and Mr. Nellor are flying up.

<sup>7</sup>Nellor later swore Surine picked up the letter at the Congressional Hotel but did not know it was from Gerald L. K. Smith. Critical press reports pointed out that Surine, Senator McCarthy's investigator, was a former FBI man who had been dismissed from the Bureau "for disregard of rules and regulations."

Nellor and Surine saw Freedman at midnight, December 5.

*Wednesday, December 6:* Nellor and Surine saw Ralph De Sola, obtained copies of the affidavit he typed at Freedman's home, and flew back to Washington—Nellor to give the material to Lewis, Surine to give it to McCarthy.

That night Lewis told his radio listeners how his man Nellor had flown to New York. Lewis also quoted triumphantly from De Sola's affidavit—the same affidavit which was submitted to the Senate Committee two days later—on December 8—when it reopened its hearings on Mrs. Rosenberg.

From then on, of course, the story is known.

There are a number of fascinating epilogues. When it became embarrassingly patent to everybody that the case against Mrs. Rosenberg was no case at all, and that the plot against Mrs. Rosenberg was sparked by anti-Semites, Fulton Lewis, Jr., broadcast an unequivocal denunciation of Freedman and Smith. This had painful repercussions for this industrious pair. Smith, notoriously thick-hided, sought to explain away the Lewis denunciation in a letter to his followers. It reads:<sup>8</sup>

Christian Nationalist Crusade  
Gerald L. K. Smith, Director  
St. Louis 1, Missouri  
Post Office Box D-4

Dear Friend:

I am inspired, encouraged and highly appreciative of your intelligent attitude concerning the Fulton Lewis matter.

Here are the facts. I went to Washington with my staff and we organized a working committee of about eleven people who participated in the campaign to prevent Anna M. Rosenberg from being given full charge over the man power of America. We enjoyed full co-operation from Fulton Lewis on this matter. His right-hand man, Mr. Nellor, came to my hotel and conferred at length with my pri-

<sup>8</sup>One cannot hold Fulton Lewis accountable for the claims of a Gerald Smith who frequently boasts of co-operation from persons who never extended it to him.

vate secretary. Not only that, but the subject matter which we dug up was used by Mr. Lewis for at least three of his broadcasts.

When the Jew campaign to whitewash the Rosenberg woman was fully organized, it was discovered that Fulton Lewis was in the thing with me up to his neck. The Jews put on the pressure and the price was "Repudiate Smith or get off the air." This is the Jew formula.

In spite of his weakness and cowardice, I hold Mr. Lewis in high esteem for the good things he has said and the vigorous fight he has put up, but he has demonstrated one thing: he fears the Jews more than he hates Communism . . .

Sincerely yours for Christ and America,  
Gerald L. K. Smith

Nellor, it should be said, roundly denied having consulted with Smith or any one of Smith's aides. Fulton Lewis's clear denunciation was already on the record.

Freedman was equally unhappy, brooding over his fiasco at the hearings and furious over Lewis's charges against him. In New York, Freedman spent four days writing and rewriting his version of the hearings for *Common Sense*, to run fifty thousand copies. Some twenty thousand copies of this issue were printed; then Conde McGinley, the publisher of *Common Sense*, who had frequently characterized Freedman as "another St. Paul," ordered the twenty thousand copies destroyed. Further, he refused to run off the additional thirty thousand copies unless Freedman deleted certain unkind references he had made to Fulton Lewis. One of the reasons for this, Freedman later quoted McGinley as saying, was that if *Common Sense* printed Freedman's unkind references to Lewis, it "would split the Nationalists." Freedman refused; finally he was driven to print a special, one-edition newspaper of his own, entitled, *Know the Truth*. Its headlines:

**SMEAR BUND RESCUES ANNA ROSENBERG  
CHARACTER ASSASSINS ACT TO INSURE CONFIRMATION  
ADOPT BLACKMAIL TACTICS  
TO WHITEWASH SENATE INVESTIGATION**

A final postscript should be appended. On December 14, the Senate Armed Services Committee met and put in the record hundreds of letters and telegrams received in the course of the hearings, praising Mrs. Rosenberg in extraordinarily warm terms. They came from Americans in every walk of life, including General Eisenhower, General Walter Bedell Smith, Bernard Baruch, James F. Byrnes, the late Robert P. Patterson, Robert M. Hutchins, John Hay Whitney, Mrs. Fiorello LaGuardia, Victor Riesel, and Tex McCrary.

A subcommittee composed of Senators Byrd, Cain, and Hunt reported that it had read the full FBI file on Anna M. Rosenberg. "There is not a word in the files, as I have read them, from start to finish, to support any of the un-American charges alleged against Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg," Senator Cain declared. Indeed, what he had read was "highly complimentary to the personal character, to the competence, capacity and to the loyalty" of Mrs. Rosenberg.

Benjamin Freedman sent several voluminous memoranda to the Committee, correcting his testimony; he remembered now that there had been a letter from Gerald L. K. Smith introducing Nellor and Surine. He included a plaintive statement to the effect that he had never made any charges against Anna M. Rosenberg; and that if he could be of any assistance to her now, "she has only to turn to me to receive it."

Ralph De Sola sent the Committee an indignant telegram—collect—demanding further examination of himself, Mrs. Rosenberg, McGraw, and other witnesses who were "obviously lying and concealing."

And Colonel Galusha, who had been asked by the Committee to obtain a copy of the Gerald Smith letter to Freedman, reported:

"Mr. Freedman says he has become disgusted with the Rosenberg case and torn up and flushed down the toilet his complete

file on the case, including the letter from Mr. Smith. He says if he knew Mr. Smith's address, he will try to get a copy."

The Committee voted unanimously to reapprove Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment as Assistant Secretary of Defense. A few days later the United States Senate confirmed her appointment.

We have dwelt at length on this baseless attack on Anna Rosenberg—so grotesque and yet so tragic—because it reveals much. Had the smear technique not attained so much respectability in this period, professional bigots—whose stock in trade is exploitation of racial and religious intolerance—could not have built such a monstrous edifice upon so absurd and unsubstantial a foundation. In times less marked by hysteria, the allegations of a Benjamin Freedman, a Gerald Smith, a Wesley Swift, endorsed as they were by a Rankin, a Hoffman, and their like, would have been laughed out of the court of public opinion. It would have been impossible for this witches' brew of religious prejudice, deliberate malice, and wishful thinking, to have achieved such importance that for ten days it could confuse the American people, force a U.S. Senate committee upon a shameful goose chase, use the American press to spread vile aspersions upon the loyalty of American public servants, and—not the least damaging—provide the Soviet with effective propaganda to ridicule this country throughout the world.

But the jittery atmosphere of our day, aggravated by those who cynically played upon America's concern over the Communist danger, made it possible for an accidental similarity of names to be blown up out of proportion. It opened the way for a group of unscrupulous and irresponsible men to place upon the rack a public servant of unimpeachable reputation.

There was widespread distress over the failure of the government to insure against another trumped-up "Rosenberg case" by bringing to justice those who were patently guilty of perjury. In the weeks and months that followed the collapse of

the plot against Mrs. Rosenberg, such well-known commentators as Walter Winchell, Drew Pearson, Marquis Childs, and Joseph and Stewart Alsop demanded to know why no criminal prosecutions were forthcoming. But nothing happened—the guilty are still at large.

The Rosenberg case proves that while Communism is a danger, the synthetic and irresponsible anti-Communism of troublemakers also poses a serious danger to our country today. No less an authority than Herbert A. Philbrick, the celebrated FBI counteragent who helped send the Communist leaders to jail, warns us of this danger. The author of *I Led Three Lives* emphasizes that Communists welcome irresponsible charges and name-calling by self-proclaimed anti-Communists. Communists know that such accusations add to confusion because they give an exaggerated impression of Communist strength and do damage to anti-Communist liberals. “According to the leaders of the Communist Party,” Philbrick tells us, “irresponsible anti-Communism has helped them a great deal.”

Not only the nationally known are slandered in this fashion. For every public personality who suffers such an ordeal, there are undoubtedly scores of lesser-knowns who have been similarly pilloried, but who never receive the wide publicity of an Anna M. Rosenberg.

A typical case is that of Miss Loretto Chappell, of Atlanta, Georgia. Chances are her name is unfamiliar to most readers of this book. In her instance, she was attacked and defamed by those who sought to equate her decent views on racial segregation and the FEPC with Communism. And she, in her own way, became a *cause célèbre* in the South in 1951.

Miss Chappell, a tiny, gray-haired, and rather shy lady of fifty-five, had been Director of the Children’s Division of the Georgia State Department of Welfare for sixteen years. She had

survived many a violent political regime. Resolutely aloof from political activity, she carried out her duties calmly and efficiently. She lived in quiet respectability in a modest four-room cottage on the outskirts of Atlanta, where passers-by would see her tending her small orchard and the small rustic feeding station she had set up for birds. Her background and family were beyond reproach. Her father had been the first president of the Georgia State College for Women; her mother had founded a local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution; and Miss Chappell was one of the outstanding members of the D.A.R. in Georgia. In addition, her administration of the Child Welfare Division had won recognition from the Georgia Chapter of the American Association for Social Workers, and from other authorities in the field.

All this, however, did not make her immune to the smear. In fact, she was ripe for investigation—particularly since Alan Kemper, a director of the State Welfare Department, had little affection for social workers, including Miss Chappell. He was on record with his considered opinion: “I sometimes think all social workers are abominations.”

The Georgia Legislature in 1950 had set up a joint House-Senate Committee to study the general administration of the Welfare Department. With this as a foundation, Representative J. Bush Mims, chairman of the Committee, a lawyer from rural southern Georgia, called Miss Chappell before the Committee and publicly charged her with Communism.

The evidence he had was as follows:

1. In 1946 Miss Chappell had signed a petition for a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.
2. The Committee had an authenticated instance in which Miss Chappell had actually fed Negroes in her home.
3. The Committee had impounded a number of highly suspicious books from the Child Welfare Library. These included *Red Wine First*, by Nedra Tyre, a series of moving autobio-



graphical sketches, as told to a compassionate case worker by her clients on relief, many of whom were Negroes; *The American Race Problem*, by Reuter; *Our Rejected Children*, by Albert Deutsch, an ex-newspaper reporter and writer on social evils; and, most damning of all, *The New Russia's Primer*. This last had been a 1934 Book-of-the-Month Club selection, at the time highly recommended for all literate readers. For seventeen years it had gathered dust on the library shelves, and it was still there when Committee agents raided the library—and Miss Chappell, as head of the division, was responsible for it even though she had never gotten around to reading it.

Behind the Chappell charges lay more than Kemper's dislike of her. Political observers sensed that the Mims Committee investigation could be used as a weapon to discredit the Georgia merit system, which protects employees in the Welfare Department and prevents replacement of competent civil servants by political hacks. Restoration of the spoils system, they said, was the real issue. Through the Welfare Department, children were placed for adoption, and children's homes were licensed. Fully seventy per cent of Georgia's funds for dependent children came from the Federal Government and were handled by the Welfare Department. If Miss Chappell could be effectively damned before the bar of public opinion, and as a result ousted, the merit system would be discredited. The Georgia legislature might then revise the law, and politicians would be able to take back the power of patronage.

Miss Chappell had no counsel at the hearing. Mims demanded of her why she had signed the FEPC petition.

"Because our President has requested such legislation," Miss Chappell replied serenely.

Mims brandished *The New Russia's Primer*, and demanded:

"Miss Chappell, are you a Communist? Are you a member of the Communist Party?"

"No, sir, I am not," she replied. "To my knowledge I have never even known a Communist."

Mims opened the book. On the flyleaf was written the name "Van Dusseldorf."

"Do you know anyone named Van Dusseldorf?" Mims asked.

Yes, said Miss Chappell. She knew a former social worker, O. van Dusseldorf, who apparently had purchased the book for the library before she, Miss Chappell, joined the Department in 1934.

Wasn't Van Dusseldorf a German or a Russian name, Mims pressed?

Miss Chappell shook her head. No, the name was Dutch.

Mims closed the book with a bang. "Obviously," he said, "Van Dusseldorf is a Red, and you, Miss Chappell, are a Red from the bottom of your feet to the top of your head!"

A few minutes later, without allowing her to make a defense, Mims adjourned the hearing until March 28.

Miss Chappell emerged furious. She was going to fight. "This is a witch hunt, all right, a sure enough witch hunt. Only I'm not a witch, nor for that matter, a Communist. I'm going to fight this right through. I'm not a person of importance, but the issue created by Mr. Mims's attack against me is vital to my native Georgia. I'm going to stand up and I won't retreat."

In her struggle, she was not going to be alone. Miss Chappell seemed to be an easy target because, having kept remote from political intrigue, it was thought she could not count upon political support. But she had innumerable friends—and when the hearing was resumed on March 28, they were on hand to see that the good name of Chappell was not blackened.

The *Atlanta Constitution*, one of the South's most distinguished newspapers, also came to her side. In an editorial entitled "What's Going On in the Welfare Department?" it asserted: "We object to Miss Chappell's being charged with Communism without any apparent basis save that she once

signed a petition in behalf of an FEPC measure . . . Miss Chappell is a native Georgian, of an old and respected family, and there is nothing we can find in her record to indicate any reason for the charges.”

Before the March 28 hearing got under way, Miss Chappell obtained an attorney, Representative James Mackay. He insisted she have the right to make an open statement before the Committee. When the hearing began in a small, crowded room in the Department of Public Welfare in Atlanta, Miss Chappell, reading from notes, declared firmly:

“As far as my loyalty to this state is concerned, let me say that I am Georgia-born, Georgia-raised and Georgia-minded. I conceive it to have been in the tradition of Georgia women to stand up for the helpless, and particularly for the children of all races and creeds. Those who do less are not a part of the Southern and Christian tradition as I learned it from my family.

“I am not a Communist nor a Communist sympathizer and have never been either. As a lover of books, I think they should be read; the Communists think they should be banned. I welcome truth and loathe wild charges, unsubstantiated assertions and character assassinations. These are well-known Communist methods. I want to see peace and amity between all men and races of men; Communists foment race and religious hatred . . . Mr. Mims’s wild and irresponsible charge of Communism is the very type of un-American conduct which in the end tends to set American against American; sow the seeds of distrust and disunity, divide our country and weaken it before its dreadful enemies—the real Communists. . . . A Communist, gentlemen, is a dangerous specie—not one who is guilty of merely the good, old American practice of holding an opinion different from someone else on politics or legislation.”

Here was a ringing defense of traditional liberties, which at the same time demonstrated Miss Chappell’s innately southern background. The *Atlanta Constitution* was sufficiently im-

pressed to reprint her statement on the editorial page the following day.

Not so Mr. Mims. He thundered:

"Miss Chappell, you say that you selected books for your library on the basis of their helpfulness in your work. I want you to explain to me and to this Committee how you think that *Red Wine First* would be helpful to you as a child welfare director."

The book contained twenty-five brief sketches of human beings on relief, as told to a case worker. The author, a social service expert for eleven years, described with tragic simplicity the emotional bewilderments, sex experiences, and physical illnesses suffered by relief clients in the course of lives of appalling deprivation. Apparently paragraphs concerning sex involvements disturbed Chairman Mims.

"Mr. Chairman," Miss Chappell declared, "in all ages books have been written which have shown the seamy side of life as well as the bright and beautiful. There are doubtless in those books—and many others we have read—things that are shocking. I remember when I was a child of fifteen how profoundly shocked I was at some passages in the Bible. . . . I felt sure this would come up and I brought my Bible with me today. I should like to read you a passage from it."

With this she read from the story of incest in Lot's family.

Mims had to listen with growing discomfort—and then change the subject. What—he wanted to know, his blue eyes sharp behind rimless spectacles—was her explanation for siding with a local faction in the Unitarian Church which urged admission of Negroes to membership? (This, by the way, was national policy of the Unitarian Church.) Was this not proof of her Communist orientation?

Her answer: "I believe churches should be open to all who wish to enter."

Mims returned to cross-examination about the books. Attor-

ney Mackay then pointed out that the books were not even at hand in the hearing room—the chairman had impounded them. Why the silly precaution, Mackay demanded to know, in view of the fact that the same books were available in every library in Georgia.

“Because we want to keep them where we will know where they are,” declared Mims.

“How do you do it?” inquired Mackay. “Do you put a padlock on them—or sit on them?”

“We put them in the safe where they will be kept,” intoned the chairman.

But the chairman did have an excerpt about sex from *Red Wine First*. He read it aloud slowly and demanded of Miss Chappell, “Now what does that have to do with the child welfare of the State of Georgia?”

“Mr. Mims,” replied Miss Chappell in a very tired voice, “nobody could possibly state that every word in every book he selects is valuable or helpful.”

Mims hammered again on the FEPC petition. He insisted that it called upon Congress to put the FEPC into law. Mackay, Miss Chappell’s counsel, asserted that it called on Congress simply to support the FEPC as a fact-finding body, and he demanded that the Committee produce a copy of the petition to determine who was right.

The Committee refused.

“Am I to understand that you refuse me the right to see that petition?” Mackay demanded.

“I don’t have it,” Mims retorted. “Just remember you are not at a nigger meeting this morning.”

“I ask calmly, then, may we see a copy of the petition which your committee showed the press?”

“I don’t have it but your client already has stated that she signed it,” Mims snapped.

Another member of the Committee, Senator Farrar, broke in:

"Miss Chappell, you say that you are Georgia-minded, but you signed that petition calling on Senators to vote for the FEPC. Do you consider that Georgia-minded?"

"I do," said Miss Chappell. And she went on to point out that the chief evidence Mims had for his charge of Communism was that she had supported legislation "which has been asked by both major political parties, the President of the United States, and by Senator Taft and Governor Dewey. Mr. Mims is in the same position as those who called Senator Taft a Communist because he is for public housing."

Mackay again called upon Mims to withdraw his charge of Communism. Mims now denied he had called Miss Chappell a Communist. He had called her a "Red," he declared, but not a Communist.

Mackay said, "Don't you mean that she looks like a Truman Democrat?"

"No," Mims fired back. "She looks suspiciously like a Red to me."

Mackay repeated his demand for a retraction. But Mims was firm. "I don't withdraw the statement," he insisted, "because I think the Communist Party is trying to break down racial barriers in the South, and I think she is going along with it. I don't agree with that, and I think that is Red activity. Certainly it is Red sympathy."

In the light of Mims's attitude, Mackay felt compelled, he said, to go forward with his client's defense.

A number of character witnesses, among them leaders of Atlanta society and professional life, appeared for Miss Chappell. They, too, were interrogated on the subject which seemed to exercise Mims almost as much as the FEPC petition—Miss Chappell's endorsement of the move to allow Negroes into white churches.

Dr. Hines Roberts, one of the city's best-known pediatricians, took the stand in her behalf. "I have known Loretto Chappell

since I was a very small boy and she was a very young girl. I would like to say that I deem it a privilege to be counted among Miss Chappell's friends. I am now the medical director of a children's hospital and in that capacity I know, too, that she is doing an outstanding job in the Welfare Department."

The chairman began quietly: "Doctor, let me ask you this question. Do you favor breaking down the barriers of segregation of the races?"

"I can't say that I do," replied the witness. "But I think I am probably about twenty-five or fifty years behind Miss Chappell. I can see as I look back I have changed my attitude considerably toward the races. As I deal with them, I even call certain Negroes Mr. and Mrs."

"Dr. Roberts," Mims demanded. "Do you, sir, favor commingling of the races in the churches?"

Dr. Roberts observed dryly: "Jesus Christ did."

Having scripture quoted to him twice was almost too much for Mims.

Red-faced, he retorted:

"That wasn't my question. Do *you*, Dr. Roberts, believe in it?"

Dr. Roberts hesitated. Those in the room could almost sense that he was thinking of his practice, of his reputation, of all that could flow from a statement considered heretical by many Georgians.

But there was a question of conscience which loomed larger than these, and he replied slowly:

"Mr. Chairman, I have never advocated the commingling of the races in the churches, but to the extent that I do not believe in it, I would to that extent not be a Christian."

At this point a member of the Committee, seated near Dr. Roberts, was seen to make a gesture as if he were spitting. He rose abruptly and walked away, as if to say, "I will not sit by such a man."

A few moments later a Mrs. Lanier from Milledgeville, Ga., took the stand in defense of Miss Chappell. Mrs. Lanier was a determined little woman of perhaps eighty, a member of the D.A.R., and a person held in high esteem.

"I have known Loretto Chappell since her birth," she testified stoutly. "I had the privilege of teaching her in college. She was a wonderful student, and she was outstanding in her leadership. She is refined, she is able, and she is just as loyal as any man in this room. . . . She is a Georgian—gentle, and true, and noble."

Mims, feeling himself on safe ground, asked her:

"Do you, ma'am, favor the commingling of the races in the churches?"

"In the Episcopal Church?" Mrs. Lanier inquired gently.

"Miss Chappell," the chairman explained, "is a member of the Unitarian Church."

"Well, you know," the little lady informed Mr. Mims, "the Great Episcopal Church in Georgia has colored people in it."

"Do you believe in that?" demanded the chairman.

"I am a Southern Methodist," grinned Mrs. Lanier.

What those in the room were witnessing was the breaking down of a long-held taboo. As Lillian Smith, who has written intensively on racial problems, recently pointed out, segregation in the South "has been like a primitive taboo. A taboo says, 'You must never question, you must simply obey.' A taboo's magic lies always in its ability to keep everyone from daring to break it or talk about breaking it. If one person questions it aloud; if two question, three, four—ah, then, the magic no longer works."

Miss Chappell had spoken out; Dr. Roberts had questioned the taboo. Mrs. Lanier had poked fun at it. All three were re-



spected leaders in the South. If they—and still others—insisted upon breaking the conspiracy of silence, the Kempers and Mims and others would ultimately find themselves invoking a magic which no longer existed.

In the end the Mims Committee adjourned its meeting. No action was taken on Miss Chappell. The Committee was scheduled to report to the Georgia State Legislature at a later date.

Miss Chappell came out of this ordeal unshaken.

But in late 1951, eight months after the hearing, she submitted her resignation. Her personal situation, she said, had been made intolerable by Kemper. Triumphant at last, Kemper accepted her resignation “with prejudice”—thus blocking her re-employment by any other state agency. Miss Chappell, still the fighter, promptly declared that she would appeal to the State Merit Board. Kemper reported that Miss Chappell’s resignation was “good riddance.”

The last word was had by the *Atlanta Constitution*. It declared editorially on November 1, 1951:

McCarthy tactics have claimed a victim in Georgia . . . The resignation of Miss Chappell followed eight months of unsuccessful attempts to oust her, her only guilt being, as far as we can determine, that of insisting on a sound child welfare program.

In brief, the politicians accused Miss Chappell of being a Red, because she attempted to keep political considerations out of administration of the child welfare program. Unable to find irregularities in her operation of the division, these politicians resorted to the tactic of making wild charges in order to discredit her as an individual.

Insofar as forcing her to resign is concerned, the tactics were successful. It must be said, however, that her resignation came about after she realized the program was being harmed. In other words, they, in a measure, destroyed “public confidence” in the program . . .

The methods used to force Miss Chappell’s resignation are a distasteful distortion of the democratic process. Let’s not allow McCarthyism to become a factor in our already questionable political picture in Georgia.

If there is a conclusion to be drawn from a study of these two cases, those of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg and Miss Loretto Chappell—each illustrative of many more which could be cited—it is that the smear technique, by its repeated use, is becoming so much a part of the American scene that many American people find themselves accepting it with less and less repugnance. We see a growing indifference to this whittling down of an individual's constitutional rights. It is this kind of indifference in the body politic which can provide the climate in which totalitarian philosophy takes root and grows.

Perhaps an appropriate note with which to end this chapter is the statement of Frank D. Foley, former President of the Georgia Bar Association, who felt impelled to speak his mind to the members of the Mims Committee trying Miss Loretto Chappell.

He spoke of witch-hunting, of character defamation, and he said:

"As a member of the Georgia Bar for more than forty years, I have been watching for some time the increasing danger to personal liberty arising out of today's fears and theories. I have been concerned as to whether in our zeal for security we would not run the risk of destroying personal liberty, the very heart of the democracy we are all trying to preserve.

"I do not believe that the Communists will ever be able to destroy this great nation of ours by force or otherwise, as long as it remains united and true to the traditions of our Constitution, and so long as we preserve the integrity and dignity of the individual.

"I do not believe that any significant number of people will trade our way of life for a deliberate dictatorship.

"So, as I see it, the best defense against Communism is the freedom and protection of the liberties of the individual citizen. We must keep alive the right of freedom of worship, speech, the press, and of thought, and a respect for the rights of others. This respect is basic to our American way of life and it demands that we never seek to destroy our neighbor and his reputation simply because we hold a different opinion.

"No two of us think alike on all subjects. The only one who is dangerous is he or she who would try to change another's opinion by force or coercion. That is why Communism is so inconsistent with Americanism: because it seeks to change our society by means other than persuasion and the ballot."

Mr. Foley had felt this way, he said, since he had begun the practice of law many years ago. But the danger of the irresponsible charge—the danger of what he had seen at work in the case of his friend, Miss Loretto Chappell—had never become so vivid as it had as he sat in the hearing room and saw these forces at work. Only then did the tragedy become real, and the danger "to all of us" apparent.



# 3

## MEDICINE MEN

In the case of Anna Rosenberg an almost successful attempt to destroy her was made by a small group of men. Some of these were recognized bigots. But the ranks of bigotry in America are by no means limited to them and their friends. They are only part of a far larger group in this country devoted to the promotion of hatred. Among these are the unashamed sellers of racial and religious hate who make no pretense of concealing their attitudes: indeed, they flaunt them. Their language is violent and frequently hysterical. In some instances they have become so obsessed with their prejudices that they see the world as one of sinister plots and conspiracies—Jewish, Catholic, or Negro, as the case may be. They feel it their mission to convince everyone within reach of voice of the monstrous “truth” they have discovered. To some of them, virtually every national and international development can be cited as proof of their allegations—can be fitted into their warped picture of society.

Among these, too, are still others of whom it cannot be said that they even pretend to believe the fantastic pictures they paint. These are spiritual cousins of the turn-of-the-

century medicine man, with his bottled cures and his spellbinding oratory. They sell a product—hate—because selling it is good business. Some of them boast incomes in six figures. They may appear to be clowns; they may be scoffed at by the more intelligent reader as quacks and mountebanks; but their impact is considerable. The unsuspecting recipient of their hate literature is not likely to know how absurd a figure they cut, and how limited the constituency for which they pretend to speak. Yet each year such hate publications find their way into at least half a million American homes, and well over two million persons read them.

The original statements of these hate sellers are repeated in whispers and soon gain wide circulation. In this way the lies frequently become the “facts”—the initial source of which no one remembers, but everyone recognizes as “having heard somewhere before.” As the creators of many public misconceptions, therefore, these propagandists cannot be dismissed as crackpots of no importance.

To understand more clearly the nature of these anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, and Negro-baiting agitators, we have made intimate studies of a selected group of typical propagandists in each field.

#### I. THE ANTI-SEMITIC

The first two centuries of American Life were relatively free of anti-Semitism. Old World poisons contributed some hostilities, some isolated incidents. But generally, the struggle for liberty and freedom had given Jews, Catholics, and Protestants equal rights. By the earliest days of the Republic, the American attitude was that all religious groups, so long as they taught good morals, were good.

The development of Negro slavery gave life to an anti-black racism which, once started, spread inevitably against other

racial groups and ultimately to religious minorities. The anti-Negro theories propounded so intensely before and during the Civil War were enlarged afterward to include victims against whom there were economic and psychological reasons for applying them. Orientals on the West Coast quickly became the targets of racism; soon after 1882 all Chinese immigration was stopped. The pattern was set; by 1900 the country witnessed an active campaign for the reversal of the traditional American policy of free immigration.

At the same time, America was growing into a world power. Third- and fourth-generation Americans were organizing into ancestral prestige societies. Distrust of foreigners grew in a nation composed originally almost exclusively of foreigners or their sons. By 1910, America was no longer the land of unlimited frontiers; competition was tougher; newspaper advertisements began to show evidence of discrimination against Jews in employment; the doors to many professions were closing against them. A wave of Jewish immigrants was trying at that time to adapt itself to American life—many of its members had come from eastern European countries where social patterns were vastly different from those of the West. Hostility centered about the “foreign qualities” of these Jews so eager to fit themselves into the New World scheme of things.

By 1915, anti-Semitism had become such a facet in American mores that a Jew, Leo Frank, was lynched by an Atlanta mob rallying to the slogan, “End outside Jewish interference in Georgia.”

After World War I, immigration was cut drastically by crude racial and religious quotas. Without newcomers to the United States, industrial expansion slackened and competition for jobs became fierce; tensions became greater. By the 1920s, almost every leading college had some kind of quota system for Jewish students. The Ku Klux Klan had venom enough to attack Jews as well as Negroes and Catholics. The *Dearborn Independent*

contributed to the problem by publication of the forged "Protocols of the Elders of Zion."

Then came the depression and, in 1933, the rise of the Nazi Party in Germany. Nazism upset the stability of Europe and revived the traditional American fear of involvement in foreign wars. It also meant that the leaders of a large nation, for political purposes, were aggressively interested in spreading anti-Semitism throughout the world.

Some German-Americans joined Fatherland groups. Frequently, their defense of Germany became a defense of anti-Semitism. Nazi persecution of the Jews, they said, was actually meant to save Western civilization from "the menace of world Jewry."

Spurred by the depression and the emergence of Nazism, anti-Semitic organizations flourished in the United States between 1938 and 1941. There were hundreds of these groups—composed of isolationists, extreme nationalists, and racial purists. Their leaders were men like William Dudley Pelley, George Deatherage, Gerald Winrod, and Father Charles Coughlin. The latter focused his sermons on the economic inequities of the day and attracted followers by warning of an international plot of Communists and bankers to hand the world over to the Jews.

In addition to the Silver Shirt and Christian Front types, many persons, deeply concerned about keeping the United States out of war at all costs, used the fictitious Jewish issue as a last desperate measure. Charles Lindbergh and Senator Gerald P. Nye were among them.

By the time the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, anti-Semitism had reached its peak. Even after America's entry into the war—when the nation was fighting for survival against a racist totalitarianism—it was commonplace to hear men like Congressmen Jacob Thorkelson and Robert R. Reynolds blatantly attribute American participation in the war to sinister Jewish influence.



Today the purveyors of openly anti-Jewish prejudice use a small number of propaganda themes, upon which they build variations to keep pace with current events: Judaism is synonymous with Communism; Jews dominate the United States Government, banking, films, press, etc. The United Nations, the Marshall Plan, the establishment of Israel, the campaigns for Civil rights and modern education—all these are seen in terms of a vast Jewish plot for world conquest.

Added to these in recent years were new “evils” allegedly brought about by Jews. These included the Administration’s foreign and domestic policies; the alleged infiltration of Communists into the State Department; the Korean War and our participation in it; the appointment of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg; the dismissal of General MacArthur; and even the rise in the cost of living.

*Forrest C. Sammons*      There’s a misleading quality about Forrest C. Sammons when one first meets him. A large man in his late fifties, with a comfortable pouch, and a bluff, hearty manner, he might well pose for the insurance advertisement which shows a retired businessman living out his years in peace and contentment. He is, in fact, a retired building contractor who lives in a quiet, tree-lined residential section of Huntington, W. Va.

Sammons is considered a wealthy man—he has real estate holdings reportedly valued at several hundred thousand dollars—though there is nothing ostentatious about him. His clothes are well tailored, but he is the sort of man who seems forever bursting out of them, and at the first invitation likes to loosen his tie and collar and get out of his coat. His face is hard and his huge hands bear evidence of outdoor building work in his earlier years. He makes no secret of the fact that he had no more than an elementary-school education, and worked his way up by his own efforts to his present success. He likes to take visitors

across the river to Catlettsburg, Kentucky, and show with pride the small frame house in which he and Mrs. Sammons were married—he twenty, she nineteen—in the presence of dozens of relatives who rode down from the Kentucky hills for the ceremony. He likes to tell friends, too, of his hard-working father, a Kentucky farmer who barely eked out a living for his wife and nine children on a little, four-acre plot about sixty miles from Huntington.

On the surface, Sammons lives the life of a responsible citizen. He reads the Bible daily, does not drink, and goes home to his family at night. He is active in civic affairs, gives to charities, and participates as a board member in the Cammack Center, a community shelter for children of poor families in Huntington.

In many respects he presents a typical picture of the solid, amiable, and decent citizen.

The one respect in which he differs is this: Forrest Sammons today is one of the most vicious anti-Semitic, direct-mail propagandists in this country, a man with an overriding conviction which obsesses virtually every waking moment. That conviction is the belief that a Jewish Sanhedrin, or tribunal—masterminds of a Jewish conspiracy dating back through the generations—is busily at work today to enslave the entire Gentile world.

When, after attending a board meeting at the Cammack Center, or after delightedly bouncing one of his grandchildren on his knee, Sammons goes to his study, it is to sit down and write letters to such warm friends as Gerald L. K. Smith, Benjamin H. Freedman, ex-Major Robert H. Williams, and others. Or he will sit down and work laboriously over the composition of one of his anti-Semitic "Open Letters," which he mails to a list of six thousand persons, in envelopes which he carefully stamps with the words "Stop the Jew!" Sometimes he will include the latest issue of Conde McGinley's *Common Sense*, or an excerpt he has copied from the forged *Protocols of*

*the Learned Elders of Zion*,<sup>1</sup> or from the long-defunct *The International Jew*.<sup>2</sup> Sammons sends his letter to Governors, Senators, Representatives, and to leading figures in the South and Midwest. His list includes persons in public life who he believes can influence others, such as state and county officials, medical men, clergymen, bankers, and newspaper editors.

Not long ago Sammons sat down with a friend and opened his heart to him: he had educated himself, he said, since his grade school days. He had read many books, and racked his brain over the problems of the world. He had pored over the Bible and Encyclopedia Britannica and tried to understand what it was all about. Then, a few years ago—in a revelation which could be compared only to a mystical religious experience—it all became clear. He now knew that an evil genius lay behind almost every event that had plagued mankind. That evil genius was the Jewish Sanhedrin—the Jews organized together in an all-encompassing plot. The Jews, he declared, “had a hand in the murder of Lincoln and McKinley,” were involved in the sinking of the *Maine*, and helped provoke the Spanish-American War. Lloyd George, at the instigation of the Sanhedrin, fomented World War I. The Bolshevik Revolution was another achievement of the Sanhedrin. Switzerland had never been devastated by war because it was a Jewish headquarters. Much of the “wickedness of the Vatican” was generated by the Jews. The Jews, Sammons went on, bought their way into the British nobility and helped debauch them. Today the Jews have planted “many of the traitors and sex degenerates in the State Department” to “do their dirty work of selling out the country.” The late Secretary

<sup>1</sup>A crude forgery, dating back to the middle of the last century, which purports to reveal a master Jewish plan for dominating the world. It has been exposed time and again by international experts as utterly fraudulent, but crops up every few years “interpreted” in the light of current events.

<sup>2</sup>*The International Jew* was originally a series of articles, published in the *Dearborn Independent*, which repeated most of the false accusations contained in the *Protocols*. Henry Ford, the publisher, retracted it as early as 1927 and again in 1942 when it was reprinted by anti-Semitic propagandists.

of Defense Forrestal did not commit suicide by plunging out a window of the Bethesda Naval Hospital: he was thrown out bodily by an Army officer "working under secret orders of the Jews." General MacArthur was fired under Jewish instigation. Truman today is—as was Roosevelt before him—a pawn of the Jews. So is William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, Governor Thomas E. Dewey of New York, John Foster Dulles, and so was J. P. Morgan.

Sammons explained that he was not too clear as to the identity of the leaders of the Sanhedrin. But he suspected that its "inner circle" included Albert Einstein, the Rothschild family, the Guggenheims, the Kuhn-Loeb, Lehman and Warburg banking families, the late Harold Laski, and—oddly enough—one of the authors of this book, Arnold Forster, director of the Civil Rights Division of the Anti-Defamation League.

Whatever the case, the "plot" was monstrous, it was far-ranging, and he only hoped that others would come to see the light as he had.

If Forrest Sammons kept this interpretation of history and the forces molding it within the circle of his immediate friends, one might dismiss him as a comparatively harmless crackpot. But Sammons is a man with a cause; he spreads these convictions with ever-growing fervor throughout the country by means of his "Open Letters." To give these added prestige, he mails them under the imprimature of the "West Virginia Anti-Soviet League," a one-man organization he founded, with headquarters at 127 Woodland Drive, Huntington, West Virginia. That is the address of his home.

An example of his work is his "Open Letter to the President," sent out on May 3, 1950. It reads in part:

A careful study of Jewish history proves that the methods used by Jewish world leaders in the creation of Soviet Russia and in the destruction of the German and British empires is too fantastic to be understood by the casual reader. But since we now face the

probability of an Atomic War with Soviet Russia and since our Government is now dominated by this Jewish World Minority Machine, at last the American people must face facts.

Certainly, Mr. President, you cannot be blamed for this condition, since former leaders and the vast majority of our people have been deliberately deceived by the Marxist Minority Machine.

The record shows that the Jewish world leaders created just such a condition during the early Christian era which caused the downfall of Jerusalem and the Roman Empire . . .

In his book, *The International Jew—The World's Foremost Problem*, the late Henry Ford proved how Benedict Arnold was a victim of Jewish bribery by the International Bankers. He also proved that August P. Belmont and Juda [sic] P. Benjamin were Rothschild agents, who operated in both the North and the South in the attempt to divide the Union. Through newspaper intrigue, such men as John Brown and Jefferson Davis were used as "Gentile Fronts" by Belmont and Benjamin and by their Jewish organizations in the North and South. During the Civil War, August P. Belmont became the first national chairman of the Democratic Party. The assassination of Lincoln was traced to Juda P. Benjamin, Secretary of State of the Southern Confederacy . . .

The approaching Atomic War and the B'nai B'rith control of the world news services may prevent our proving to the public how much Jewish Marxist leaders as August P. Belmont, Samuel Gompers, Sidney Hillman, Paul Warburg, Felix Frankfurter and others came to America to set up "Gentile Fronts" and powerful political organizations for the purpose of dominating and bypassing the duly-constituted authority of the Congress, the Presidency and the Supreme Court.

In similar vein, Sammons wrote an "Open Letter to Senator Taft," on March 10, 1950, in which he denounced Taft for having "joined with Congressman Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior and his un-American mother to act as co-chairmen" of the United Jewish Appeal; and in which he declared:

"Like his father, young Roosevelt has proved that he has 'sold out' to world Judaism. We must have a President who will stand for CHRISTIAN CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT. The Marxist

plan by which JUDAH is enslaving the Gentile world should not receive your support!"

In an "Open Letter to Congress," dated April 14, 1950, Sammons declared that the B'nai B'rith—which with the Anti-Defamation League is one of his special targets—"became an agitational instrument to 'split' the Union in 1861." He charged that the "vile force" which planned "the wars which created Soviet Russia . . . is controlled by the Jewish Bankers of the Rothschild dynasty represented by Kuhn-Loeb and Company—Barney Baruch, the Warburgs, etc.,—who control our State Department and Foreign Policy through their control over organized Jewry and its political money power."

In an "Open Letter to Harry Truman," written in the same period, Sammons demanded that the President "stop the Marxist warmakers," whom he identified as Henry Morgenthau, Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Judge Felix Frankfurter, and Judge Meier Steinbrink.

In an "Open Letter to Walter Winchell," in June 1950, Sammons mocked Winchell's "east-side Yiddish-British dialect" and charged that Winchell and certain of the "Ammedikin [American] columnists" possessed political power and destroyed "all opposition to the Jewish world political and financial programs." The cemeteries, Sammons declared, are "crowded with the tens of millions of Christian war dead who were victims of 'The Jews and Their Lies.'"

Sammons writes every word of his letters himself. He phrases and rephrases his sentences, checking his source material—Hitler's *Mein Kampf*; Elizabeth Dilling's *The Red Network*; Robert H. Williams's *The Williams' Intelligence Summary*; Merwin K. Hart's *National Economic Council Letter*; and—his special reference authority—a bound volume of the now defunct Dearborn *Independent*, the anti-Semitic publication sponsored by the late Henry Ford.

"Sometimes," Sammons confided to a friend, "I labor a week

or ten days over just a three-hundred-word letter I send out. I try to limit myself at first to five hundred words, get my ideas on paper, and then work over and over them. Sometimes, I get up in the middle of the night and struggle with them. Often Mother will say, 'Fors, why don't you stop wrestling with that letter? Come back to bed.' But I keep my teeth in it until it's just as I want it. I try to get everything I have to say in three hundred words. Of course, it's impossible to give the whole background of the Jew conspiracy in three hundred or five hundred words. My efforts to select just the right facts is one reason why it takes me so long. And I do my own writing because I think very hard and haven't found anyone who can choose just the right word for me."

How did Forrest Sammons get this way?

As must be obvious, Sammons is a study in contradictions. Apparently his first anti-Semitic attitudes grew out of a long-smoldering resentment against "New Deal Socialist Government snoopers" who circumscribed the rugged individualism with which Sammons was accustomed to conduct his contracting enterprises. Sammons interpreted all government controls during the Roosevelt administration as a "Jewish" phenomenon. He read the Dearborn *Independent*, and much anti-Administration and anti-Semitic literature, and he was influenced. He began contributing letters now and then to the "Reader Speaks" column of the local newspaper, the Huntington *Herald-Advertiser*. In these letters, the forerunner of his direct-mail campaign, he denounced such persons as Henry Morgenthau, the columnist Max Lerner, and Harold Laski, never openly mentioning the word "Jew," but suggesting that they were engaged in dark intrigues against the welfare of the United States.

In 1948, when Benjamin H. Freedman was fighting against the Israel cause at the United Nations, he came across some clippings of Sammons's *Herald-Advertiser* letters. Freedman

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

promptly got in touch with Sammons. Freedman helped to sound out Sammons's "understanding" of the Jewish question. He explained to Sammons his pet thesis that the Jews of today are not really Jews but descendants of a Mongolian tribe, the Khazars, who were converted to Judaism. He explained to Sammons his belief that the Rothschild family dominate Britain today through a number of shadowy personalities. To Sammons, who had been laboring to find a pattern in history which he could understand, Freedman's version fell in perfectly with the picture slowly emerging in his own mind.

But the greatest catalytic agent in the transformation of Forrest Sammons into a professional anti-Semite was his meeting with Gerald L. K. Smith in St. Louis on September 27, 1949. The annual convention of Smith's Christian Nationalist Crusade was to be held there, and both Smith and General Van Horn Moseley, a nationalistic and anti-Semitic propagandist, were to speak. Sammons went to St. Louis and was warmly received by Smith and his wife. Smith asked him to come up and sit on the platform and then introduced him to General Moseley. Sammons was properly impressed, but when a few minutes later Moseley rose and launched into a vituperative, rabble-rousing attack on the "Sanhedrin" and the "Jew-Communist plot," Sammons was frankly ill at ease.

"I was embarrassed to sit on the same platform and seem to be endorsing that violent presentation," he told a friend who came to his home one evening. "But I thought it over, had a long talk with Moseley and several with Smith and his group, and like a revelation, the whole picture became clear to me. I found Smith an upstanding and courageous citizen. He just misses being one of our great national leaders."

Mrs. Sammons, who had been listening attentively while her husband spoke, broke in. "Fors, why do you say 'might have been?' Can't Smith still be a great national leader in this country?"



Sammons shook his head. "No," he replied. "Smith is too old and has too many enemies to be able to build up the kind of an organization he would need for national domination."

By "national domination," Sammons later explained, he meant the kind of dictatorship Huey Long had been building up in Louisiana when he was assassinated by "that Jew Weiss"<sup>3</sup> under the orders of the Sanhedrin.

From the time of the St. Louis meeting, Sammons became one of Smith's most ardent supporters. He was so taken with him that he promised to send Smith \$500 a month to help the work of the Christian Nationalist Crusade, and when he learned that Smith planned a trip East, he invited him to come to Huntington and meet a group of leading citizens "so that they can see you don't have horns." Smith agreed, and said he would bring along Mrs. Smith—"the little woman," he called her—and his private secretary. Sammons invited more than two hundred persons to the party, but avoided telling many of them that Gerald Smith would be guest of honor: in all, some forty-five persons came.

"Smith was in fine form and made a rousing talk," Sammons said. "'The little woman,' lovely in her traveling costume, stood beside him throughout the evening and accompanied him on a couple of visits I took him on the next day."

In return for Sammons's gratifying interest, Smith saw to it that Sammons was placed in touch with like-minded friends. In a matter of weeks, Sammons became bolder. Where at first he had hesitated to mention the word "Jew" in his newspaper letters, he now used it openly. On November 20, 1949, two months to the day that he met Smith, he announced the organization of his West Virginia Anti-Soviet League, and began his direct-mail activities with a pamphlet explaining the dangers "which we face from the World Communist or Soviet Movement."

"This is not something new which I have 'dreamed up' my-

<sup>3</sup>Dr. Carl A. Weiss, who assassinated Huey Long, was not a Jew.

self," he wrote, "but represents years of research by such men as Henry Ford, Charles Lindbergh, Congressman Hamilton Fish, Martin Dies, Judge George W. Armstrong and others whose names have been 'smeared' and ridiculed and whose reputations have been destroyed by the Pearsons, and the army of 'Winchells' who are the guardian angels over the Soviet plans."

Sammons's "Open Letters" find their way to many more than those on his mailing list. They are reprinted in various hate publications and are distributed wholesale at meetings of Gerald Smith's Christian Nationalist Crusade, Wesley Swift's Anglo-Saxon Christian Congregation on the West Coast, and at other nationalist and anti-Semitic meetings throughout the country. Nonetheless, Sammons's enterprise is still a rather homespun affair. His envelopes are addressed and stamped individually, although the "Open Letter" is printed outside his home. His list of names is his own; he does not trade lists with others in the movement. Before the autumn of 1950, Sammons financed the printing and mailing out of his own pocket, and had never asked for financial aid from professionals in the field, or for dues or subscription fees. But in October 1950, in sending out an "Open Letter" "exposing . . . the Lehman-Frankfurter-Morgenthau Invisible Government," he enclosed a fifteen-page pamphlet and wrote to those receiving it:

"Each booklet will solicit funds in order to multiply its circulation. It is estimated that individual mailing will cost approximately twenty cents per copy."

With this first appeal for funds, Sammons graduated from amateur rank to professional.

All of this activity, to be sure, has not gone entirely unnoticed in Huntington, particularly because Sammons has since gone into larger mass production. Puzzled and often irate townspeople call him up, or stop him on the street, and say, "Fors, what are you up to? A friend gave me one of your letters the

other day, and honest to goodness, I never heard of half the people you write about."

Sammons takes this in his stride. "Yes, my family is sometimes embarrassed by the cracks made about me by some of their friends. It's part of the whispering campaign of the Anti-Defamation League. My wife has always backed me up, followed my readings and findings about what is really going on in the world. But she was fearful and doubtful at first about some of my findings. What convinced her that I am on the right track and really getting the lowdown was the visit of the Gerald Smiths. She saw what an intelligent and worldly wise man Smith is, and had a chance to have long talks with Mrs. Smith, that wonderful little woman. They convinced my wife that we are on the right track."

In this conversation, Sammons elaborated on the fanciful plot. "If you want to know the record of the Sanhedrin over the centuries," he said earnestly, "read the Old Testament. The pages drip with murder, rape and treachery. Imagine glorifying the theft of a birthright! A father goes in for incest to perpetuate the race. Then look how the Jews glorify the exploits of Mordecai in the Book of Esther. He plants spies throughout the land and in the palace. He gets a weak king into a drunken stupor, so drunk that he insists that his wife do a strip tease before the crowd. I tell you, every verse in the Book of Esther is packed with meaning. There is the warning. There is the pattern of Sanhedrin treachery and thirst for power.

"All through history you find their hand at work. They contributed to the demoralization and eventual fall of the Roman Empire. Jewish intrigue had a hand in contributing to the violence and backwardness of Europe during the Dark Ages. Why, the Borgias were Jews. In later centuries, the hand of the Sanhedrin can be seen in the succession of wars. A Jew bribed Benedict Arnold. There was Jewish influence back of Thomas

Jefferson's machinations in generating the War of 1812, a diversion to help Napoleon in his drive on Russia. There was plenty of Jewish influence in the godless French Revolution. There was Jewish propaganda supporting Harriet Beecher Stowe in her campaign. Another Jew carried on a similar provocateur role in the Confederate Army. In World War I, the Sanhedrin planted Walter Lippmann to spy out for them and stay at the elbow of Secretary of War Newton Baker and help shape his war policy. Clemenceau was a Jewish stooge. The Sanhedrin fomented World War I, World War II, and now they're fomenting World War III. And they've planted their people all through the State Department.

"Representative John Rankin knows what it is all about and is an able fighter. What a smearing and distortion of real qualifications he had from the Jew-backed commentators!" Sammons's usually flat voice rose in indignation. "Representative Rankin is an intelligent and educated gentleman, but he is presented as a clown and a loon. They have tried to destroy him by making him a laughingstock of the press and radio."

Among others working in the same field with him, Sammons has great respect for Benjamin Freedman, especially after Freedman told him he had spent more than half a million dollars of his own money "in the cause" and had put thousands of dollars into *Common Sense*.

"Freedman's all right," said Sammons. "He's a first-class historian and an all-right Jew. If only I could win over about fifty Freedmans—fifty all-right Jews—what a job we could do! If they understand the conspiracy that they are unwittingly supporting, they would turn against it. I would rather look to fifty Jews who put their hearts into the fight as does Ben Freedman, than five hundred lazy Gentiles who would not even make the effort to understand the subject. If the small Jews do not see the light and rebel against this Sanhedrin tyranny, the Jews, big and little, must be exterminated or interned."

He paused. "I know what I'd do to break the power of the Sanhedrin; First, pass something like the Rankin Bill,<sup>4</sup> fining and imprisoning those who join the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Then I'd exterminate the known leaders, starting with Arnold Forster. Then, if the situation becomes acute, I favor interning all the Jews. I know this would be a hardship on many of the small Jews who don't understand the conspiracy. But they continue to contribute to the conspiracy and as such are parties to it. Interning would put a stop to the positive harm they are doing."

As to himself, and this tremendous cause he had taken up: "Oh, I've had my troubles," he said. "Anonymous calls, garbage dumped on my porch, remarks made to my family that I'm cracked. I'm losing friends, but I don't care. Most of the people today are too lazy or too busy chasing pleasure to bother to find out what it is all about." He paused again, and flashed a warm, friendly smile. "My job, you see, is to wake them up."

*Benjamin H. Freedman* Like Forrest Sammons, Benjamin Freedman, whose activities we have glimpsed in preceding pages, might be regarded by some as a fanatic. Benjamin Freedman has a sizable fortune which he devotes almost entirely to the spread of anti-Semitic lies, distortions, and calumnies; he possesses a dynamic drive, an almost religious fervor, which allows him to stop at nothing; and he suffers from a martyr complex, which leads him to accept and even invite ignominy and exposure. This combination makes him, despite all the ridicule heaped upon his head, a dangerous man.

Although Forrest Sammons was already anti-Semitic, it was "This was a bill introduced in 1949 by Representative John Rankin, calling for a year's imprisonment and a fine of \$10,000 for anyone who joined the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Thousands of letters supporting the bill were sent throughout the country by the Ku-Klux Klan over the signature of Bill Hendrix, national adjutant of the K.K.K. Congress was not impressed; regarding the bill as frivolous; members of the House ignored it completely and the proposal died in committee.

Benjamin Freedman who helped push him farther along the road. Although a number of persons were interested in tarring Anna M. Rosenberg, it was Freedman's persistence, energy, and enterprise which brought the situation to a point where a Senate investigation was necessary. And then, there is the story of *Common Sense*.

Until recent years, this vulgar hate-sheet, denounced by such varied groups as the American Legion, the Holy Name Society, and the American Jewish Committee, had struggled along with the die-hard readership of a few thousand who were willing to pay one dollar a year for it. Freedman, who had already brought attention to himself by purchasing full-page advertisements in New York and Chicago newspapers to express his views, cast about for a better vehicle to reach the vast masses of people. He came upon *Common Sense*. It was published in Union, New Jersey, conveniently near his home in New York City. Freedman decided to make use of it. He subsidized it and took over its editorial policy.

Overnight, *Common Sense* became the most widely circulated anti-Semitic publication in the country. More than eight hundred thousand copies of two issues alone are estimated to have been printed and mailed out gratis; they virtually blanketed the United States and even found their way into foreign countries. They were sent to members of Congress, U.N. delegates, parent-teachers associations, Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs, American Legion Posts, Order of the Eastern Star, Knights of Columbus, the Shriners, college libraries, newspapers, radio stations, business organizations, and men prominent in economics, teaching, politics, and foreign affairs. Thousands of Americans who never before had been exposed to such violent expressions of religious hate against their fellow citizens found themselves reading "exposures" of frightening, un-American, Jewish-Zionist-Communist conspiracies—voluminously "documented" from purportedly authentic sources—without

any idea that what they were reading was the product of one man's twisted and envenomed mind. The cumulative effect of Freedman's activities should not be underestimated.

It is worth while to examine a little more closely the life and works of Benjamin Freedman—and see precisely what sort of person he is.

Benjamin H. Freedman—the *H* stands for Harrison, who was President of the United States when Freedman was born—was sixty-one on October 5, 1951. He was born in New York City, one of five children of Moritz and Hannah Kafferman Freedman, a Jewish couple who had emigrated from Hungary. The elder Freedman was a successful clothing manufacturer.

All accounts indicate that from childhood on, Freedman was a difficult and quarrelsome person, repeatedly engaged in disputes and, later, in litigation with individuals and organizations. At De Witt Clinton High School, New York, he was considered rather bright, but erratic, and a poor student. He was forced to take three subjects three times to obtain a passing grade in them.

In the 1920s, Freedman made several trips to Germany. He became the American agent for various products manufactured in Germany and elsewhere in Europe. Freedman then entered the cosmetic field. By 1925 he had acquired a ninety-per-cent stock interest in the John H. Woodbury Soap Company, which he later sold for a considerable sum. He participated in a number of other business ventures, including real estate and the operation of a chain of beauty shops. In at least one of these ventures he was involved in an assault and battery case.

In 1934, when he was forty-three, he married Rose Schoendorf Audley of New York, a Catholic who had been married and divorced. Since 1938 Freedman has been living at 300 Central Park West, in New York City, a well-known residential

apartment house. He soon began to attract attention among other tenants, particularly after World War II broke out, when he openly said he was in favor of Hitler's cause and predicted that Germany would win. At one time he remarked to an associate that he would "like to do business with Hitler; it would be a splendid business opportunity." Yet, despite such observations, he was active as an air-raid warden and even helped spur a war-bond drive in the neighborhood.

After the war ended, Freedman found himself increasingly involved in the Jewish-Arab question. At the time—1945—thousands of Jewish homeless and displaced persons sought to emigrate to Palestine. A joint Anglo-American committee of inquiry had been appointed to see whether it was feasible to allow one hundred thousand Jewish survivors of Nazism to resettle in that country. The committee returned after four months' study in the D.P. camps, in Palestine and in the Arab states, with an affirmative recommendation.

A few months earlier, Freedman began to receive Arabs at his apartment. Soon he was active in pro-Arab and anti-Zionist propaganda. Beginning May 2, 1946—the day after the Anglo-American Committee report was made public—and continuing at intervals for more than two years, full-page advertisements of the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine appeared in New York and Chicago papers, and in the Paris edition of the New York *Herald Tribune*. The League asked for contributions of one dollar and declared that \$1,000,000 was sought to help carry out its purposes.

One of these ads contained this excerpt from a Cairo newspaper:

In the U.S.A. there is a Jewish colony . . . in the political field they have made themselves a power . . . [and] has dealt a death blow to all the ideals of America's democracy . . .

The advertisements also declared:



**THE POLITICAL ZIONISTS EXPLOIT UNTRUTHS ABOUT PALESTINE**

They are seeking to misinform people everywhere in order to pervert for the benefit of their political program the sympathy of the world for the persecuted Europeans of the Jewish faith.

**WILL AMERICAN BLOOD FLOW IN PALESTINE?**

The President, the Congress and the People of the United States are aware of the gravity of sending our Armed Forces abroad to carry out recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee.

**DID U.S. DELEGATION TO THE U.N. JEOPARDIZE OUR NATIONAL HONOR AND NATIONAL SECURITY BY USE OF MANY UN-AMERICAN, NON-AMERICAN AND ANTI-AMERICAN WAYS TO WIN VOTES NEEDED TO RECOMMEND ZIONIST PALESTINE PARTITION PLAN?**

This last advertisement, which appeared in the *Chicago Tribune*, closed with the following appeal:

Write your Congressman today. Tell him that this country should not be dragged into a war to create a nationalist sovereign Jew state in Palestine. If the United States sponsors the Zionists' political ambitions in Palestine, war is inevitable. Territorial aggression by a world-minority nationalist group is no reason to plunge us into war. Act before it is too late.

The League's advertisements were signed:

Representative of Co-operating Persons of the Christian Faiths: R. M. Schoendorf; Representative of Co-operating Persons of Arab Ancestry: Habib I. Katibah; Representative of Co-operating Persons of the Jewish Faith: Benjamin H. Freedman.

Actually, the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine was a one-man organization—a corporative façade for Benjamin Freedman. "R. M. Schoendorf" was his wife. Habib I. Katibah was an Arab propagandist for the Institute of Arab-American Affairs, the successor to an Arab organization which had co-operated with Nazi groups before the war. And Benjamin Freedman represented no organization of persons of the Jewish faith. The American public, therefore, was presented with a

totally misleading picture of the League, its nature, and the purpose for which \$1,000,000 was being solicited from them.

The story behind these ads is an interesting one.

In 1944 Benjamin Freedman, retired, and with time on his hands, belligerent toward the world and toward the fact that he was a Jew, heard a broadcast sponsored by the American Council for Judaism, a Jewish anti-Zionist organization. He was impressed. Later, as he told a friend, he went to a Zionist meeting and was overwhelmed at the strength of Zionist sentiment and the angry reception accorded anti-Zionist hecklers from the audience. It must be remembered that word was then creeping out of the fate of the Jews in Nazi Europe; that the British White Paper had closed the doors of Palestine to thousands of Jewish refugees who might have escaped there. Freedman wrote a series of violent advertisements, warning of the Zionist "menace" and bringing in his pet "Khazar" theory, based on his own studies, that the Jews of today are not Jews at all, but descendants of a wild, illiterate Mongol tribe called the "Khazars," who had plotted through the centuries to take over all of civilization. For five months he tried in vain to persuade the American Council for Judaism to sponsor his advertisements. He went to the Arabs. The Arabs were interested, but suspicious of him. As Freedman related the story, he finally decided to go ahead on his own, and formed the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine.

After the ads appeared, Freedman called a press conference and admitted that he was the originator and financial "angel" of the League. He said he had paid for the advertisements out of his own pocket, and added:

"If it costs me \$50,000, \$100,000, or \$500,000, I will pay it. I started that and not a nickel has come from any outside source, except for a few scattered dollars that have come from people who read the ads. England isn't giving money to me and the Arabs aren't giving it to me."

By May 1946, Freedman had become so much a part of the Arab picture that he was helping draft important policy statements. That month, an official delegation from the Arab Office, headed by the Egyptian Minister to the United States, visited then Acting Secretary of State Acheson. They presented him with a long memorandum, reported to contain the view of the Arab states, bitterly attacking the findings of the Anglo-American Committee. Later, during one of Freedman's many appearances in court—this time as character witness in a libel suit brought by Hallam Richardson, his attorney and former associate of Joe McWilliams, the street-corner anti-Semitic orator—a New York *Herald Tribune* news clipping was introduced reporting the Arab delegation's visit to Acheson. On the clipping, next to the paragraph describing the reading of the memorandum, there was written in Freedman's handwriting, "Prepared by myself and Katibah Thursday." In another column adjoining the same news story, Freedman had noted: "It was worth all the effort."

Freedman was particularly in his glory in early 1947 when Ahmed Hussein, leader of the fascist Green Shirts of Egypt—an organization patterned upon Hitler's Brown Shirt legions—came to the United States on a propaganda tour. He was royally entertained by Freedman. Hussein traveled about the country addressing anti-Jewish rallies, sharing the platform with Kurt Mertig and Ernest Elmhurst, pro-Nazis who had been jailed for anti-Semitic disturbances. Before Hussein returned to Egypt, Freedman was not only the principal speaker at a farewell banquet in Hussein's honor, but insisted upon paying half the bill. Freedman and Hussein discussed ways and means to defeat the Jews, and Freedman unburdened himself to Hussein as to the personal attacks and threats he said were being made against his life by the Zionists. When Hussein finally left, Freedman drove down to the airport to see him off and gave him as a parting present an autographed photograph of himself.

After Hussein arrived in Egypt, Freedman maintained this warm relationship by cable, letter, and transatlantic telephone. In the autumn of 1947 Freedman cabled Hussein—addressing him as “Dear Brother,” and signing himself “Your Brother Ben Freedman”—offering to help him purchase an automobile here for shipment to Egypt. Shortly thereafter Freedman, who was energetically fighting the Zionist cause at Lake Success, cabled Hussein again. The cable read:

Dearest Brother. Letter received. Attending everything requested. Very busy United Nations situation. Writing fully this week. Extend His Eminence wishes for continued vision, courage, strength, struggle behalf justice his people. Giving him fullest co-operation. Family send love to you all.

“His Eminence,” Freedman later admitted, was the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem—the same man, it should be pointed out, who during the war had broadcast from Germany to the Arabs in the Middle East and Europe: “Kill the Jews wherever you find them. God is with you.”

A few weeks later, in October, a glimpse into another phase of Freedman’s activities is given in a cable he sent to a man he identified only as “a businessman” in Bombay, India. It read:

Have negotiated immediate establishment Pakistan Thompson sub-machine gun factory equipment available here. See letter. Battle hard. UN recommendation full Islam equality. All political determinations. Writing fully. Success.

Freedman’s affection for Hussein was reciprocated in full. Hussein wrote a laudatory article for a Cairo newspaper in which he paid tribute to Freedman. It was entitled: “An American Jew Spends His Efforts and Riches in Protection of the Arabs.” Its opening paragraph read:

I had hardly set foot in New York when I heard the wonderful story of Mr. Freedman. Is there anything more wonderful than to see a Jew spending his money on propaganda for the Arab cause?

Hussein also reported what Freedman had told him of the constant dangers in which he lived. Hussein quoted Freedman as telling him:

They [the Zionists] did all that you can imagine, including an attempt to kidnap my son. It went so far that I was forced to hire two Australians to watch us when we went to Florida. Every day, approximately, a visitor from among them used to come to me. He would start his conversation quietly, would pass on to threats if I did not mend my ways. I wouldn't pay any attention to him, but would quietly show him to the door, being sure that because I share the feelings of the Arabs, I shall live as long as Allah wants me to live and I will leave this world when Allah will prescribe it.

Hussein's own newspaper, *Young Egypt*, also published an admiring article about Freedman, illustrated with the photograph Freedman had given Hussein. The article read in part:

And the greatest Jew active in this endeavor is Mr. Benjamin Freedman, who has spent up to today nearly one hundred thousand dollars in combating Zionism. He has shown his determination in devoting his life and his fortune in the cause of supporting the Arabs of Palestine and the defeat of Zionism . . . The ties of friendship and affection between him and Professor Ahmed Hussein have become so close that Freedman addresses him as "Brother" and on this page you see the picture he presented to Professor Ahmed Hussein.

Freedman's work at the United Nations was coupled with intensive lobbying in Washington. Among those he met there was Congressman Ed Gossett (D.) of Texas, who was later to involve himself in the Rosenberg smear by introducing Freedman to Chairman Russell of the Senate Armed Forces Committee. Freedman met Gossett through Merwin K. Hart.

What happened thereafter, as Freedman related it:

"I started to tell Gossett about the Khazar conquest of the world. He stopped me, ran out, and brought in seven other Congressmen. They pulled up chairs. I started to talk, and didn't stop for nearly five hours. They urged me to get a larger group

of Congressmen together. It cost me over \$500, and was well worth it."

"It" was a dinner Freedman gave for some fifty-two Congressmen at the Mayflower Hotel, where he spoke on the Jewish-Zionist menace and the Khazars, and where he also distributed copies of his League's advertisements and of other educational literature.

Freedman's conference with Gossett evidently bore other fruit. Early in 1948 Gossett spoke on the floor of the House, denouncing the Palestine Partition decision of the U.N. and America's support of it. He quoted from a statement issued by the Grand Mufti. This accused the Jews of "outrageous provocations." Gossett introduced this statement into the *Congressional Record*, along with his own prefatory remarks. He began by saying: "Few of us know anything about the Grand Mufti, his history, his philosophy or his program"—although the Mufti has been one of the most publicized Middle East figures in the last quarter of a century. Gossett added that he was sure the Mufti "does not deserve all of the censure that has been heaped upon his head" and then quoted in full from the Mufti's attack upon the Jews.

Freedman at once paid for several thousand reprints of the *Congressional Record* insertion, and presently these began floating about Washington. In addition, other thousands were sent through the country under Gossett's Congressional frank, thus farther spreading the Mufti's propaganda.

Freedman's own literary effusions were reprinted and endorsed in such well-known anti-Semitic publications as Charles Hudson's *America in Danger*; Gerald B. Winrod's *The Defender*; and C. Leon de Aryan's *The Broom*. Freedman's renunciation of his Jewish faith was now a subject of ridicule among such notorious figures as the Reverend Wesley A. Swift. When someone at a Wesley Swift meeting in Los Angeles protested to Swift that he was distributing anti-Jewish literature,

Swift retorted, "Why, that's absurd. The literature to which you refer was written by a Jew named Freedman"—a reply which brought laughter and applause from his audience.

There is no question that Freedman has developed a martyr-like joy in "persecution." "Since the death of Hitler I am the most hated man in the world," he told a friend recently. "My life is in constant danger. I am Enemy No. 1. My family and I get threatening telephone calls and mail. We are insulted when we travel. Why, in a public dining room in Long Island, a Jew got up when he saw it was me and denounced me as a traitor." In a special tabloid entitled *Know the Truth*, Freedman said of himself: "Freedman is literally and figuratively crucified twenty-four hours a day." Interestingly enough, he has said that the hostility to him "is not so much from Jewish but from misguided Christian quarters: and that has been terrific."

Freedman sees himself as leading a one-man war, dramatically standing alone and fighting the "Khazar forces of evil." He has said that he is disillusioned even with the Arabs. "I find many of them fearful and intimidated about doing anything. I have discovered that they are not a great united people or even a linguistic or religious unity. I found them fighting among themselves, this one a British agent and that one working for an American outfit, each one just as ready to knife one another as to form a front against the common enemy—the Khazars who are taking over the world."

If there is one fortunate aspect of the Freedman story, it is the fact that Freedman is so obsessed with the subject of the Jews that he disturbs even those who would like to make use of him. He speaks rationally on business affairs, the weather, the character twists of his own colleagues; but once on the subject of the Jews or the "Khazars," he fixes his listener with an almost mesmeric eye and, like the Ancient Mariner, must tell his story. His effectiveness is also hampered by his belief that he is a writer and his insistence that he must write his own material

for any publication with which he is associated. Yet, he continues to work diligently, no whit abashed by all that has happened.

Perhaps the best picture of Freedman's mental processes, his frustration, and his self-delusion was given when he spent several days in 1948 as a witness in Mid-Manhattan Magistrate's Court in New York, during the criminal libel action brought by his attorney, Hallam Richardson. Richardson accused the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, and the Reverend Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, one of its executives, of criminally libeling him in a piece of literature which described him as having "long been known in the halls of pro-Fascist propagandists."

Richardson asked Freedman to appear in his behalf as a character witness. Freedman, ready to feed his martyr complex, did so. It was in the course of this hearing that Freedman:

Claimed that he was receiving death threats over the telephone and had been warned that "one of these days you and your son will be found in the river";

Demanded police protection from his home to the court;

Refused to enter the courtroom unless every one inside had been either identified or searched for weapons, but finally entered when Magistrate Hyman Bushel said he would issue a warrant for his arrest;

Shouted at reporters covering the hearing: "All newspapermen are lice!";

Admitted that he had written an article for Merwin K. Hart's *National Economic Council Letter*, in which he said, "But America and American Christianity stand at a crossroad. The majority must decide whether it will longer submit to being the tool of a small but ruthless and unscrupulous minority of a minority people";

Declared that the "Zionist dictators of American policy" were Senator Herbert H. Lehman; Bernard M. Baruch; Samuel I. Rosenman; David K. Niles; Thomas J. Watson, president of the



International Business Machines Corporation; and Edward M. M. Warburg;

And asserted that though he had been born a Jew, the Jews had "excommunicated him"; that he was a member of the Masons but practiced Catholicism; that he was not within the Catholic Church because "pressure was brought to bear to prevent me from being baptized."

When questioned on this last point, Freedman said he had been told it would be difficult for him to enter the Church because former Supreme Court Justice Joseph M. Proskauer, honorary president of the American Jewish Committee (which Freedman had once sued for libel) was "the attorney for Cardinal Spellman."

Magistrate Bushel asked him:

"Do you mean to say that Judge Proskauer or any other human being could bring pressure on Cardinal Spellman?"

"No," said Freedman. "But I was told—"

"Oh, I see, the Jews put you out and the Catholics won't let you in," interrupted the Magistrate.

"I was too discreet," said Freedman, finally, "to go back to those Jesuit priests under whom I studied, to press the issue."

In the end, Richardson's libel suit was dismissed. Magistrate Bushel, in handing down the decision, commented that Benjamin Freedman was "an international meddler and a crackpot."

In addition to such men as Forrest Sammons and Benjamin H. Freedman, there are dozens of little known quasi-professional troublemakers scattered in various communities in the nation. They are busy people, self-appointed missionaries who never receive the publicity nor the plaudits of the more prominent professionals; and they are forever occupied with gathering together anti-Semitic material of all kinds to give it greater dissemination. Typical of such persons is Helen P. Lasell.

Let us look at her closely.

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

*Mrs. Helen P. Lasell* Helen Lasell is a buxom, energetic clubwoman from Long Island, New York, and one of the newest crusaders in disruptive causes. In 1951, Mrs. Lasell, until then scarcely heard from, was busily operating an anti-Semitic propaganda center from her home, and planning to establish an anti-Semitic lecture bureau, which would enable her to send speakers throughout the country. She was also organizing a New York State unit of the American Flag Committee, to counteract the drive made by "America's traitors, the teachers of Jewish faith in the public schools and any others who would have the U.N. flag replace the Stars and Stripes."

Mrs. Lasell's activities are limited in scope, but she provides an excellent case study of a new type of super-patriot who has become involved in peddling hate.

Though militant at heart and doing strenuous battle against a multitude of Jewish "plots," Mrs. Lasell is hardly a martial figure. She is in her early sixties, is about five feet, six inches tall, fat, has short, crinkly gray hair, and would fit perfectly into one of those famed clubwomen cartoons which the late Helen Hokinson used to contribute to the *New Yorker*.

But Mrs. Lasell and those of her friends whom she has interested in her work have gone a long way from the peaceful paths of garden clubs and the literary atmosphere of poetry recitals. Instead, she and her friends gather to hear such patriots as Joseph P. Kamp, the anti-Semitic propagandist, and Allen Zoll, founder of the notorious National Council for American Education, tell how they can save the country. Instead of poring over Browning and Tennyson, she devours the hate-filled gutter literature of Conde McGinley and Marilyn Allen.<sup>5</sup> In-

<sup>5</sup>Marilyn Allen is a frenetic, anti-Semitic pamphleteer in Salt Lake City. The nature of her writings and her point of view may be seen from a typical quotation from her book, *Alien Minorities and Mongrelization* (Meadore Publishing Co., 1949): "I have a friend who is a registered nurse . . . She knows of a case during World War II where a White man was given a transfusion of Negro blood, and he went crazy. It is a COMMUNIST LIE when they tell

deed, she does more than read it. As a convert to the cause, she stuffs copies of McGinley's incredible *Common Sense* into her capacious handbag and bustles about downtown New York, surreptitiously leaving behind her a trail of copies on subway seats, counters of department stores, tables of restaurants, and anywhere else she thinks they may do good.

In her home she has both a recording machine, to take down broadcasts she thinks significant, and a photostating apparatus to copy items that she reads. She takes material from the *National Economic Council Letter* of Merwin K. Hart, anti-minority pamphleteer, and from similar publications, and she briefs speakers who address women's groups. She boasts that many organizations frequently call her to recommend speakers for them. She supplies Joseph Kamp and others with a regular clipping and photostatic service. She also sends out a flood of unsolicited clippings—with her comments—to persons whom she wants to influence, ranging from President Truman and Eleanor Roosevelt to Senators, Representatives, and governors.

She prides herself on her investigative work for anti-Semitic professionals. She collects everything "evil" she can find about Jews, about the Truman administration, about the United Nations; believes it all; and disseminates it. She is in touch with many known bigots and bigoted organizations, and she keeps on hand an enormous stock of their pamphlets and "exposés" which she offers for sale through the mail. She delights in the fact that her telephone is almost constantly busy with calls from persons "in the movement" who want newspaper clippings, information, and background material on suspicious personalities in the news.

---

you that one man's blood is no different from another . . . Any informed Jew-wise person wonders just how YIDDISH Americans can get . . . The day is NOW HERE when the White American must choose one of two courses: (1) Inform himself on the world-wide power of Jewry, and then oppose it, at least in America; OR (2) go down into slavery under a Jewish-dominated world of COLOREDS."

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

Not long ago Mrs. Lasell unburdened herself to a friend.

"The country has gone to the dogs," she declared. "What F.D.R. started, little Truman and that Red Acheson are finishing. Everything that's happening to the country fits into a master plan of Stalin's. He is conniving with the international Jews, Frankfurter is one of the worst. Truman is just a yes man for Frankfurter, as Marshall was a front for Anna Rosenberg. The State Department is a bunch of reds. Hiss made our policy and helped concoct the U.N., another dodge to cripple our nation. The U.N. is being run for Stalin's convenience, as a sounding board for spreading Communist propaganda over the entire world. The Jewish Gestapo runs everything. You can't get the truth over the radio—except from Fulton Lewis—because the Jews control all the networks. Senator Kefauver won't get far because his lawyers are controlled by the Jewish Gestapo. The Jews control the major food companies—they're to blame for the high price of bread and milk—and those prices will stay up so long as the Jews are in there."

Mrs. Lasell is a repository for anti-Semitic and neo-fascist propaganda. She makes no attempt to be consistent. The enemy she sees is so slippery and cunning, the plot so all-encompassing, that she finds no difficulty in accepting as truth outrageously contradictory allegations against those she seeks to destroy.

"I don't wish to take any credit, receive any praise, or win any glory for doing this sort of indirect, undercover, patriotic work," she says. "It is done only because of love of my country and in the name of freedom. There are so many people in important places who don't understand the score and do not realize the conspiracy that is ruining the country. I must tell them the story."

Mrs. Lasell was for some time a member of the D.A.R., and now works a great deal among D.A.R. members, trying to persuade local units to pass resolutions against co-operating with

U.N. activities. She lists Rhodes scholars as among traitors to the United States, because they are allegedly trying to sell out this country to British Socialists and to the Jews. In line with this, she scans lists of Rhodes scholars, trying to find those with Jewish names. She explains that the reason for their devotion to world government, which she considers a curse and a menace, is "because every Rhodes scholar is honor-bound by oath to work for world empire. That was Cecil Rhodes idea—world empire—for the British." She believes that somewhere behind the entire scheme lurk Jewish conspirators out to capture the world. She urges various patriotic organizations in the Forest Hills section of Long Island to oust Jewish members.

Mrs. Lasell was born and reared in Plattsburg, New York. She taught for some years at the Brooklyn Friends School, a Quaker institution. She regards herself as a Christian Scientist, although she is antagonistic toward many Christian Science groups because they have former Jews as members.

Her husband, Harold, is an easy-going man, an executive with a company in Long Island City, New York. They have no children. Mrs. Lasell, having no consuming responsibilities, and being an energetic and even aggressive person, found time heavy on her hands. She tried writing short stories, but was unsuccessful. She joined many women's clubs, but found little there to inspire her. "They always wasted their time quibbling about rules and regulations and in reading long reports—they never *did* anything," she says. Then, about ten years ago, she began to study extreme nationalist and anti-Semitic literature. A new world was opened to her; she found the great mission for which she had been craving, and to which she could dedicate her life.

In many respects Mrs. Lasell is at the beginning of her activities. With her energy, her entree into various social quarters, and her dedication to the "cause," she possesses a potential for increasing the harm she does. In the field of women's clubs and

women's patriotic associations—she helps the divisive work of the hate cabal. She acts as a transmission belt of prejudice, bridging the gutter and the parlor; some of the publications she sells and distributes would certainly not be tolerated in the homes of her friends, were it not that she gives them the imprimatur of her social standing.

A listing of these publications would include Hart's *National Economic Council Letter*; George Armstrong's anti-Semitic and anti-Negro books and pamphlets; Forrest Sammons's *Open Letters*; Robert H. Williams's *Intelligence Summary*; Gerald Smith's Christian Nationalist Crusade books and pamphlets (Mrs. Lasell is herself on the mailing list of Smith's *The Cross and the Flag*); Joseph P. Kamp's publications; Allen Zoll's publication; and of course, Conde McGinley's and Marilyn Allen's vituperative propaganda.

## II. THE ANTI-CATHOLIC

Carl McIntire, President of the International Council of Christian Churches and a member of the executive committee of the American Council of Christian Churches, set the style in modern-day anti-Catholicism on November 2, 1951, when he declared:

The strengthening of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world only involves the fostering of a false religion which enslaves human souls in darkness and superstition, and from which the Protestant Reformation of the 16th Century delivered us . . . It is argued that the Roman Catholic Church has its representatives behind the Iron Curtain . . . that the information which the priests obtain through the Confessional may be given through the Vatican to the West for some advantage in fighting Communism. Rome will sell her secret confessional system for political world power. But actually the Roman Catholic Church becomes a 'spy system' through the priests, with the priests' loyalty first to the Vatican. If that obtains in other countries, it obtains, too, in our country . . . Are not the

Roman Catholics in the United States committed to a foreign power and do they not owe 'obedience and submission' to its head, the Pope? . . . If the priest inside the Iron Curtain countries is a 'spy' for the Vatican state, why is not a priest in the U.S.A. the same?

Anti-Catholic prejudice has marked the American scene in more or less virulent form for more than a century. In the 1830s, there were widespread campaigns against the Catholics. In 1834, Samuel F. B. Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, under a pen name, published a series of anti-Catholic attacks in the New York *Observer* which were later brought together in a book entitled, *Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States*.

This bigotry erupted into violence on the night of August 11, 1834, when the Roman Catholic Ursuline Convent in Charlestown, Mass., was burned down by a mob aroused by groundless rumors of immorality in the Convent. Morse's book—and scores of others to follow—had their influence, and in the 1840s and 1850s anti-Catholic violence broke out in such major cities as Philadelphia, New York, St. Louis, Louisville, and Baltimore.

The first organized group to make bigotry its mission was The Native Americans, which denounced the "rapid and extraordinary increase of the foreign population" and warned that foreigners might eventually become "the instrument of the overthrow of this now happy and envied Republic."

Soon the organization replaced this vague illusion with specific charges against Catholics. A spokesman of The Native Americans in Congress attacked the "flood of immigration sweeping its millions of foreign Roman Catholics over the land . . . Every shipload of immigrants was and (will) further be accompanied by the necessary number of Jesuit priests, who are to locate them judicially with a view to the political control of certain states, or the organization of new ones in the West . . . How many Jesuit Senators shall we have in the course of the next twenty years!"

By 1852, anti-Catholicism had become a political movement. A secret society, the Grand Council of the United States of North America, more popularly called the Know-Nothings—because its members replied to all questions about the organization, “We know nothing”—came into existence. It demanded that every member be a native-born citizen, a Protestant born of Protestant parents, reared under Protestant influences, and not married to a Catholic.

Its voice was a magazine, *The American Organ*, and its object was “to resist the insidious policy of the Church of Rome and other foreign influence against the institutions of our country, by placing in all offices in the gift of the people, or by appointment, none but native-born Protestant citizens.”

Within the brief space of two years, the Know-Nothings became a political party, the American Party, and succeeded in electing governors in nine states. Eight of the sixty-two members of the Senate were members of the party, as were 104 of the 234 members of the House.

The threat of Know-Nothing bigotry moved Abraham Lincoln to write:

How can any one who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? . . . As a nation, we began by declaring that “All men are created equal.” We now practically read it: “All men are created equal except Negroes.” When the Know-Nothings gain control, it will read: “All men are created equal except Negroes, foreigners, and Catholics . . . !”

The Know-Nothings gradually disappeared as a result of inner corruption and growing public disapproval, but anti-Catholic persecution continued, now under the banner of the American Protective Association, organized in 1887. This group, which published *The Menace*, rose from obscurity to become one of the most influential forces in the nation. In 1894 it had entrenched itself in at least twenty-four states, and seventy



weeklies helped spread its propaganda of hate against those of the Catholic faith.

An inner split along partisan lines over its support of William McKinley for President, the nation's preoccupation with the Spanish-American war, and, above all, the American people's growing resistance to this combined xenophobia and anti-Catholic sentiment, finally led to the disruption of the movement and its disappearance.

At the turn of the century, Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore could assert that Catholic citizens could rely upon the spirit of every true American "to nullify the spasmodic efforts of bigotry; for, though a large proportion of Christians do not sympathize with Catholic doctrines, this dissent is not carried over into political or social life."

The next few decades, however, saw the appearance of Thomas E. Watson of Georgia. His Populist Party began as a respectable agrarian movement, but ended as a demagogic phenomenon which not only defamed Catholics but also attacked the Jews, and thus set a pattern for successors in the field. In 1915, the "Invisible Empire" of the second Ku Klux Klan mobilized for a four-pronged attack upon Catholics, Jews, the foreign-born, and Negroes. The K.K.K.'s Imperial Wizard, William Joseph Simmons, while proclaiming his belief in the "fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," circulated a statement reading:

We exclude Jews because they do not believe in the Christian religion. We exclude Catholics because they owe allegiance to an institution that is foreign to the Government of the United States. To assure the supremacy of the white race, we believe in the exclusion of the yellow race and in the disenfranchisement of the Negro.

Simmons's successor as K.K.K. leader, Hiram Evans, in an address in 1923 before seventy-five thousand Klansmen at Dallas, charged that Negroes, Catholics, and Jews were undesirable elements, who defied the "very fundamental requirements

of assimilation” and could never “attain the Anglo-Saxon level.” As to Catholics specifically—to them “the Presidency at Washington is subordinate to the priesthood at Rome.”

The Klan at its height in the early 1920s numbered five million members spread through every state in the Union. But public exposure of its terrorism and racketeering led to its speedy decline, although the Klan spirit of intolerance could not be completely extirpated. It flared again in 1928 with the nomination for President of Governor Alfred E. Smith, a Catholic, and played a significant role in his defeat.

Today, far from having spent itself, anti-Catholic bigotry still seeks to carry on its century-old vendetta. Indeed, the line of thinking of the Catholic baiters has changed little since Samuel Morse’s day. There is still the fear of Roman Catholic “conspiracies” to dominate the world in general and the United States in particular; there are still aspersions cast upon the loyalty and patriotism of American Catholics because of their “allegiance to a foreign power”—the Vatican.

Like their anti-Semitic brothers in arms, the anti-Catholic bigots exploit acute political issues and current tensions; in the past two years their central theme has been that the Catholic Church is a totalitarian threat to Americans which is equal—if not more dangerous—than that of Communism.

The arsenal of anti-Catholic propaganda, as we have examined it, shows a number of rather obsolete but effective weapons. A number of pseudo-religious publications have been trying to revive the hysteria of the Know-Nothings, and of the American Protective Association. There are still the same alleged “revelations” by ex-nuns and ex-priests, the same “exposés” of “convent horrors” and alleged convent “immorality.” A typical anti-Catholic magazine currently being distributed is the *White Horse*, edited by J. A. Dennis and published in College Park, Georgia. In its pages we read such vile charges

as: "Catholic religion is idolatrous and very corrupt. The Pope is a warmonger, and a corrupt politician. A wolf in sheep's clothing. . . . The Catholic religion is rotten to the core. It is exceedingly dangerous to American freedom."

Like the anti-Semites, the anti-Catholics frequently resort to outright lies and crude forgeries. Not long ago, the National Catholic Welfare Conference denounced a series of fraudulent letters designed to arouse ill will against Roman Catholics. These letters are circulated to Protestants and purport to be written by devout Catholics who rage violently against Protestants. One of these—from the pen of a nonexistent "Monica O'Toole McNoonan, Regent, Mother of God Immaculate Nocturnal Adoration Society"—condemned "all . . . false heretical Protestants who attack the Holy Father in Rome and seek to destroy this Catholic nation . . . The only schools in this country which honor God and the blessed Virgin Mother of God are the parochial schools of the Holy Roman Apostolian Church and not your atheist Red-Communist public schools."

Another letter was signed by a Francis Xavier O'Toole. It bore the return address of a nonexistent "Society of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Mother of God." This hoax not only condoned the ill treatment of Protestant missionaries in Italy, but also threatened:

Worse is in store for you as you will soon find out . . . You together with all other false heretics and agents of evil will surely burn forever in Purgatory for your damnable acts. You have absolutely no right to be in Italy. The Italians are members of the True Church and they don't need you lousy Protestant missionaries to confuse and mislead them—so that you had better stay off of where you don't belong.

Lies, forgeries, hysterical distortions, fraudulent letters—such are the means by which anti-Catholic bigots attempt to promote hate.

*Harrison Parker* Harrison Parker is a benign-looking gentleman of seventy-three, and a direct descendant of Deacon Thomas Parker who was among the first Puritans to come to this country. Harrison Parker is also one of the most industrious professional anti-Catholics in the United States.

Parker holds the title of "chancellor" of "The Puritan Church—The Church of America," with offices at 1612 I Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. This is a church which functions without a congregation, without meetings, and without a church edifice. There are no dues and there is no ritual. Through the years, Parker has been raising large amounts of money for three well-advertised projects: to finance a general operating fund; to buy a building; and to establish a "free Bible" fund.

Parker's recent chief activities, besides money raising, have been the creation of a "Protestant Embassy," at the same Washington, D.C. address, and the publication of the *Liberty Bell*, a violently anti-Catholic paper ranging from six to sixteen pages per issue.

On the masthead of the *Liberty Bell* is the following information:

Maintained at Washington, D.C., by the free-will donations of Americans to defend the American way of life (Christianity) from the destruction by either the Roman-Catholic way of life (Paganism) or the Russian way of life (Communism).

In other of his publications—for example, his frequent *Warning Letters* on the stationery of either "The Puritan Church" or the "Protestant Embassy" Parker amends this language. Roman Catholicism is no longer Paganism but Fascism; and Greek Catholicism becomes Communism. Sometimes the Communists are characterized as "orthodox Catholics" who are trying to drive the Roman Catholics "out of the political control of Southern Europe." At the same time, Parker says, the Roman Catholics "under the cover of fighting the rapid growth of

Communism . . . are driving the Protestants and the Jews out of political control of the United States."

By such interchangeable and frequently confusing definitions, Parker is able to interpret virtually any event on the social or political scene as the result of a Catholic conspiracy.

Parker buys mailing lists and sends his appeals for money to thousands of persons who know nothing of him or his background. He couches his appeals in sober and frequently pious language, in sharp contrast to the intemperate and ungrammatical letters sent out by others in the business of selling anti-Catholic hate.

"Fellow Pilgrim into the Kingdom of God," he writes—sending along a sample copy of the *Liberty Bell*—and he continues:

This issue of *Liberty Bell* was paid for and directed to be mailed to you by a friend of yours who is aware of the Roman Catholic menace in the United States and wants to have a part in stopping its growth among the ignorant voters.

Now is the time for action by all the Protestants, if we are to prevent Roman Catholic Control of the Government and all American institutions . . . These dangers can be averted only by the united efforts of all non-Catholics. That is why the Protestant Puritan Church is appealing for your support.

If this Church had the money, it would gladly mail copies of the *Liberty Bell* to all Americans; it has not the money. Only by free-will donations can *Liberty Bell* be kept ringing the alarm against the Roman Catholic foreign enemy! Be as generous as you can . . .

His final paragraph is designed both to bring in money and to secure an ever-increasing audience for his propaganda:

A donation form is enclosed. Sign one yourself. Or mail us \$2 in currency or money order for twenty copies of *Liberty Bell* of this issue to be mailed either to names which you submit or to names which the Church will select for you. Your name will not be used.

Sincerely yours,  
THE PURITAN CHURCH—  
THE CHURCH OF AMERICA  
by its Chancellor

Comparatively restrained as Parker personally appears to be, no such restraint marks his *Liberty Bell* and his *Warning Letters*.

On March 18, 1950, thousands of copies of Number 24, Volume II, of the *Liberty Bell* rang out this message:

ROMAN CATHOLICS HAVE TORN DOWN THE "STARS AND STRIPES" AND  
HOISTED THE RED FLAG OF ANARCHY OVER THE UNITED STATES.

Impeach J. Howard McGrath, the Roman Catholic law-violating Attorney General of the United States.

In a bitter attack upon the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church in this country, the publication declared:

The Pope of Rome is the sole owner, proprietor and "Dictator" of the independent European totalitarian government of the Vatican . . . The sole business of this Vatican Government is to collect money with which to agitate for world dictatorship by the Pope of Rome; the agitation is done through his Church of Rome.

The church is the wholly owned money-making subsidiary of the Vatican Government. In the year 1948, it had in the United States, to collect money, 189,000 agitators, dressed up as priests and nuns of the Church of Rome. They collected 139 million dollars in cash. The "sales talk" was "charity." The balance of 132 million dollars was used to spread in the United States propaganda for the rule of the United States by the Pope of Rome from the Vatican, Italy . . .

In the name of "dummies" this Pope of Rome owns, free and clear, 702 million dollars' worth of tax-free real estate in the United States alone . . . It is known that the Catholic Bishop of Washington, D.C., has a standing order with a local banking house to purchase for "his account" \$200,000 a week of United States stocks and bonds. It is rumored in Wall Street that the Pope of Rome now owns the controlling interest in the Chicago & Rock Island Railway, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway, and other American railroads which were reorganized through the Roman Catholic-controlled courts of Chicago, with the Roman Catholic "receivers" and the Roman Catholic lawyers.

In this issue, Parker prints an artist's sketch of the "Protestant Embassy" which he says will be built on the corner of Tilden

Street and Rock Creek National Park, N.W., Washington, D.C.  
Concerning it he writes:

The sole business of this "Embassy" will be to agitate for Peace, to promote the religion of Jesus which causes Peace and to "pressure" the Congress of the United States to close the war-mongering "Vatican Embassy" at Washington, D.C. . . .

If the Roman Catholics need an "Embassy" at Washington, D.C., to "pressure" the United States into the Pope of Rome's European wars, the Protestants and the Jews need an "Embassy" at the same place, to "pressure" the United States out of the Pope's European wars. The Protestants and the Jews have as much right to defend the United States from the blight of rule by the Pope of Rome from his Vatican as the Roman Catholics have the right to agitate to make the United States a Roman Catholic-ruled country.

This Protestant embassy, Parker suggested, would be financed by the "free-will donations of the Protestants and the Jews of the United States."

Issue Number 25, Volume II, carried Parker's attack on the Pope a step farther:

**TRY EUGENIO PACELLI, ALIAS POPE OF ROME, BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE IN GENEVA.**

Here Parker charged that the Pope had collaborated with Hitler and Mussolini in promoting World War II, and maintained fifty-five ambassadors "to and from the Vatican to agitate war." He warned that the "Vatican Government of Europe" seeks to recast the "whole social and political structure of the United States after the Spanish model of police-state dictatorship." Once the Catholics seize control of the United States, Parker goes on, both the Protestants and Jews will be robbed of their wealth and driven out of the United States by laws passed by a Roman Catholic Congress. In addition, the Constitution may be amended to "wipe out" the Protestants and Jews.

Parker frequently extends the olive branch to the Anti-

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

Defamation League, seeking to educate the A.D.L. to the alleged menace of the Catholics. On September 9, 1950, writing on the stationery of the "Protestant Embassy," Parker sent along a copy of the *Liberty Bell* to the A.D.L., and pointed out:

The Roman Catholics have nullified the Constitution of the United States and subverted the form of government established under it . . . Not a newspaper in the U.S.A. raised its voice at the destruction of all the American Freedoms by the Roman Catholics . . .

He concluded:

How many copies of the enclosed *Liberty Bell* do you want printed or circulated? The cost is \$74 per thousand, mailed in units of 1,000 either to names which you may furnish, or to names which *Liberty Bell* will select for you. All money, checks, P.O. orders received will be used to print and circulate more copies of the enclosed *Liberty Bell* and nothing else.

In one of his recent *Warning Letters* Parker discloses ambitious plans for the future, and the gratifying results of his fund-raising activities to date:

The Puritan Church—the Church of America is doing all within its power to stop the growth of these two "isms" [Catholicism and Communism] in the United States. Its congregation donated \$50,000 in cash to protect the other Protestants and Jews of the United States from further aggressions upon them by these two totalitarian European Governments.

Of this donation \$15,000 was used to start *Liberty Bell* and the circulation of this warning letter; \$35,000 was used to acquire free and clear a site on which to build this "Protestant Embassy"; it is on a hill overlooking the City of Washington, D.C., eleven minutes by auto from the White House . . .

Keep the Roman Catholics and the Communists out of Congress of the U.S.A. When either gets control there, the United States will be either a Roman Catholic-ruled and ruined country, like Roman Catholic ruled and ruined Italy, Spain and France; or a Russian Communist-ruled satellite like Czechoslovakia. For 1624 years, Italy has been ruled by the idea of God and the idea of totalitarian government of a Pope of the Church of Rome. As a consequence of



such rule, Italy today is a charred battleground and its once happy people are reduced to sickness, disease, female prostitution and despair; its government is "on relief" of Protestant United States. Do you want such conditions in the United States?

This is Harrison Parker in his seventy-fourth year.

The story of Harrison Parker is the story of a man who moved from racketeering in the church field to anti-Catholic bigotry. His growth into a hate-monger was slow; perhaps only a psychiatrist could determine what part frustration, revenge, and fancied persecution played in the development of this American who, in his presumably mellow years, is so filled with hate and venom.

Parker is not a man who has lived in the byways of American enterprise, or existed on crumbs from the table of the more successful. He was at one time advertising manager of the *Chicago Tribune*, a job which he left because he disagreed with the *Tribune's* investment policy. Later he owned an advertising agency in Chicago; headed a life insurance company, a number of dairies, and a grocery chain; and for several years he was the \$45,000-a-year publisher of Hearst's *Chicago American*. He resigned this last position during World War I, because he felt that the late William Randolph Hearst had not really tried to keep this country out of war. At one time in his career he ran for President on an anti-New Deal ticket.

Parker was born in San Francisco, attended the University of California briefly, and then became a newspaper reporter. He held several positions with San Francisco, New York, and Chicago newspapers, culminating with his post as publisher of the *Chicago American*. He married the daughter of a vice president of the Union Pacific Railroad. Through the years he has invested large sums in his various ventures and promotions.

In 1918, Parker, who had become convinced that many of

the world's problems arose from abuses in the banking and distribution system, tried his hand as a trustee of the Co-operative Society of America. He resigned after a disagreement with fellow trustees. Then he entered the banking field and sought to introduce a number of reforms of his own. He quit this endeavor and began casting about for a subject which would so engross him that he could devote his entire career to it. He was earning no money at this time, but he had invested his rather substantial earnings of previous years in stocks and securities, and he sold some of these as the need arose.

At this low ebb in his life, he met a Dr. Shepherd, minister of the Church of Christ of Los Angeles. Dr. Shepherd impressed him. After a long series of philosophical discussions with the minister, Parker came to the conclusion that lack of religion was the real cause of man's ills. Dr. Shepherd had started a "school for preachers" in his home. Harrison Parker became one of his students. Mrs. Parker was helpful; she contributed \$34,000 to Dr. Shepherd's school.

Parker buried himself in books dealing with the religions of the world and their influence on men and events through the ages. "I made up my mind that my place was with the church," he said then. His studies and his tremendous pride in his distinguished ancestor, Deacon Thomas Parker, led Harrison Parker to think of organizing Puritan groups in and around Chicago into a single group. There were a handful of such congregations, but no formal Puritan Church existed. Parker went to these various groups, advised them on their legal and financial affairs, and prepared them for incorporation under the laws of Illinois.

Here a strange interlude took place. One of his Puritan associates uncovered "evidence" that the *Chicago Tribune* had allegedly been cheating Cook County out of taxes. Parker brought action as a citizen to force the *Tribune* to pay the State of Illinois \$87,000,000 which he claimed the *Tribune* owed since:

1873. Parker even ran for the Cook County tax assessor's office in hope of obtaining a position where he could better carry on his vendetta against the *Tribune*. He received a scattering of votes. His case against the *Tribune* was thrown out of court.

In 1940, Parker established the first office of his church in La Grange, Illinois. "The Puritans have been underground since the Civil War," he said. "But now they are being organized again." Elmer Benton, who had been in the Shepherd preachers' school, became treasurer. The first "chancellor" was a Mrs. Richardson, whom Parker described as a convert from Catholicism. Her appointment piqued him—he wanted the position for himself—and after a few months she was no longer chancellor.

Parker has asserted that he was duly ordained a minister by the "College of Divines of the Puritan Church." He said Dr. Shepherd was a leader of the College. The ordination consisted of his submission of twelve sermons he had written while studying and a swearing-in ceremony. Two years later, "The Puritan Church—The Church of America," was formally organized, and in December 1945 Harrison Parker became chancellor. His duties were to promote and publicize the Puritan principles of religion, and to keep the books of the church and raise money for it.

The doctrines of the church were simple: they were Parker's twelve sermons.

About this time, Parker read of a Gallup Poll which disclosed that although most Americans believed in God, millions did not attend church. This galvanized him into action. He began marshaling all his forces. His sister, Mrs. Anita Bird of Cos Cob, Connecticut, was a wealthy woman, and Parker urged her to contribute money to a vast project he had in mind—expanding "The Puritan Church."

According to Parker, Mrs. Bird contributed \$53,000 to the cause, and Mrs. Parker gave \$5,200. Much of the money was promptly used for newspaper advertisements and for circular-

izing a mailing list of thousands of persons, which he purchased from a Chicago advertising agency. These were lists of "people seeking religious solacement."

The response was such that Parker had to move to a new office—an empty loft over a drugstore in La Grange—and hire six girls to cope with the mail.

His system of "religious solacement" by direct mail was an ingenious one. He would send out the first of his twelve lessons, entitled "Divine Healing," to those who replied to his advertisements or circulars. If the recipient liked "Divine Healing," he could buy the second lesson, and then the third, and fourth, and so on.

Evidently a great number of persons liked the lessons, for Parker boasts that he received thirty thousand responses. The contributions which came in the mail from his "communicants" ranged from a postage stamp to \$100. These moneys he said were his chief source of income at this time. In addition to buying the lessons, some persons sent him \$100 after they finished the course. Others remembered him with gifts of money at Christmas and Easter. It was at this time that he launched the "free Bible" fund, asking for contributions to enable him to distribute thousands of Bibles free to unfortunate men and women who did not possess the word of God.

Parker grew more ambitious. If he could erect a great Puritan Church meeting house in La Grange—something like the Mother Church of Christ Scientist in Boston—so he told friends—Puritans from all over the country could visit it. It could also serve as a central office for mail-order enterprises which, as Parker now saw, apparently had intriguing financial possibilities. As a result, Parker inaugurated his "Puritan Church Building Fund," and named as trustees his sister and his wife.

Dr. C. C. Waterbury, a retired physician living in Laguna Beach, California, gave the Building Fund a splendid start by contributing \$10,000. An advertising agency suggested that

Parker might conduct a puzzle contest by mail, but asked \$40,000 to underwrite it. Parker borrowed \$30,000—from Dr. Waterbury, he said—and on September 6, 1947, set his contest in motion.

This enterprise was similar to the kind conducted by some newspapers to gain circulation. In Parker's contest, however, the puzzle was the essence of simplicity. Anyone of ordinary intelligence could solve it. Those who sent in the right answers were told they were in line for a prize of \$250, and then were given a chance at a second "tie-breaking" puzzle with a grand prize of \$2,500 plus \$1,000 extra for promptness. But to be eligible for this grand prize, contestants were required to donate \$3.00, \$5.00, or \$12 to "The Puritan Church Building Fund"—and only those who sent in \$12 could receive the top prize of \$2,500. Those who sent in \$3.00 or \$5.00 would be awarded a lesser, top prize if they won.

Money began to pour in. Within five months more than \$230,000 had been received, and the advertising agency had already collected more than \$100,000 for its expenses. But by this time the Chicago Post Office Department had become interested. There had been hundreds of complaints from puzzle contestants; five months had passed and no announcement of judges had yet been made. The first letters explaining the contest had said nothing about donations. Only after contestants solved the first puzzle were they informed that to win the top prizes they were obliged to contribute as much as \$12 to a "Puritan Church" of which they had never heard.

The postal authorities halted the contest, issued a fraud order citing Parker, the advertising agency, and the generous Dr. Waterbury, and they impounded nearly seventy-five thousand letters, supposedly containing money, in the La Grange post office. On February 1949, the Federal Grand Jury handed down a twelve-count mail fraud and conspiracy indictment against Parker, Mrs. Parker, Mrs. Bird, her husband Vigo Bird, Dr.

Waterbury, and Jesse L. Steward, the head of the advertising agency. At the same time five ex-marines who had entered the contest filed a civil suit against Parker, and the Treasury Department began action against him on charges that he failed to pay income tax on the earnings of his so-called church.

An examination of his books revealed a rather surprising state of affairs, in view of Parker's experience in banking and as a financial adviser. According to government investigators, there was a complete intermingling of moneys—moneys from the contest, moneys from the general operating fund of the church, moneys from the "free Bible" fund, and other proceeds from Parker's evangelical mail-order enterprises.

The Grand Jury indictment charged that though the contest was conducted ostensibly for the church's benefit, actually it was conducted "for the purpose of enriching" its sponsors. The indictment asserted that so many correct answers had been sent in that it was impossible to judge the contest fairly. Parker and his associates, the grand jury charged, had never intended to award any prizes.

Far from being contrite, Parker was furious; he and all the other defendants entered pleas of not guilty. Parker was convinced that the *Chicago Tribune* and its owner, Colonel Robert R. McCormick, were conspiring to ruin him. He charged that Colonel McCormick was also behind the civil suit brought against him. Parker later testified in the course of his income tax hearings that Colonel McCormick had teamed up with the Catholic Church to destroy "The Puritan Church" by bleeding it to death through lawsuits. He did not explain how the Catholic Church was involved in this conspiracy, but he did refer to the "Catholic lawyers in the Government"—apparently meaning Attorney General McGrath and others.

Parker grew rabid. He charged that certain "Roman-Catholic payrollers entrenched in the Department of Internal Revenue of the United States" were responsible for the Treasury De-

partment's income tax suit against him."<sup>6</sup> The "100-per-cent Roman Catholic censorship maintained by the Roman Catholics in the U.S. Post Office" was behind the mail-fraud order against him. "Religious bigots of the foreign Church of Rome were either influenced, intimidated or bribed" to destroy his puzzle contest. He claimed that Federal Judge Michael L. Igoe, before whom his fraud trial was to be heard, was prejudiced because Igoe was a Catholic. The case was reassigned to Federal Judge Philip L. Sullivan. Parker thereupon demanded still another judge on the ground that as "a Protestant minister" he could not expect a fair trial from Sullivan, who was also a Catholic. The case at this writing is still awaiting trial, while Parker remains free on bail.

When asked by Government investigators for a list of members of the "Puritan Church," Parker could produce only a list of eighteen persons in Toledo, Ohio. He admitted these persons did not communicate with each other and thus were not a congregation. But this did not seem to concern him. He still insisted that "The Puritan Church" was a bona fide church and, as such, should be tax-exempt—as was the Catholic Church.

In April 1948, Parker moved from La Grange—there were too many Catholics there, he said—to New York; and a few weeks later, to Washington, D.C. There, in August 1948, he took a room for himself at the Hotel Claridge and rented a small office as the new mailing address for his church.

Shortly before the beginning of 1950, he published the first issue of *Liberty Bell*, using it to appeal for funds to build his meetinghouse and to further "The Puritan Church" and its objectives. Those objectives now are to combat the Catholic Church and all who belong to it, while enriching Harrison Parker.

<sup>6</sup>Ultimately, securities worth \$92,000 deposited by Mrs. Parker and Mrs. Bird in the Puritan Church Building Fund were seized and auctioned off by the Government to satisfy its tax judgment.

Like other professional anti-Catholics, Parker trades on the value of the word "Protestant." But no matter how violent his denunciations, an aura of respectability hovers over him as "chancellor" of "The Puritan Church." Parker was born on the right side of the tracks; his family background is eminently proper. He exploits Deacon Thomas Parker's name and relationship to him. His publications are well printed, competently edited. He does not allow anti-Semites or the more vulgar anti-Catholics to appear in his columns.

His methods are effective. He rarely signs his name; his publications are sponsored by "The Protestant Church" or "The Protestant Embassy," thus giving his attacks the apparent authority of a responsible, long-established, and thoroughly American religious institution. He uses newspaper items helpful to his cause; quoting, for example, an Associated Press dispatch that "Mexico Outlaws Catholic Party, Calls It a Threat." He sends his material to other anti-Catholics, who use it in their own mailings. Thus Parker's envenomed interpretation of current events and religious history receives far wider distribution. He sends his readers long, purportedly well-documented dissertations to back his allegations: he exploits every criminal or civil charge against American political figures who happen to be Roman Catholics: through guilt by religious affiliation he smears all who practice that faith. He is ambitious, he is resourceful, and he is apparently able to lay his hand on money when he needs it.

*Harvey H. Springer* A hell-fire-and-brimstone anti-Catholic leader among the rabble-rousing fraternity is Harvey H. Springer, the "cowboy" preacher—the handsome, forty-five-year-old pastor of the First Baptist Church and Tabernacle at Englewood, Colorado.

Springer is an ordained minister. He *has* a church. He has a congregation—which friends claim to be the largest in Colorado.



He is also editor of *The Western Voice*, a sensational, semi-religious, semipolitical publication with a large circulation, which carries on its masthead the legend "Christ for the Crisis." He heads the Rocky Mountain Evangelist Association. He operates the Western Voice Book & Bible Supply and the Protestant Information Bureau. He runs the Soul Winning Bible Institute, a training school for evangelists. He is on the Executive Board of the Independent Bible Baptist Missions. He is founder of the American Protestant League.

Springer has promoted the peddling of religious hatred into big business. He makes use of the radio, and is heard each morning over a Colorado station. (At one time he claimed to be speaking over twenty-eight stations each Sunday morning.) He uses high-pressure advertising methods to solicit contributions. He gathers additional thousands of dollars by well-publicized evangelical tours through the southern and western Bible belt, where audiences of nearly two thousand persons have jammed huge tents to hear his violent preachments against the Catholic Church.

Springer mixes personal glamor with fundamentalist doctrine, spicing the whole with hate and bigotry. He is a flamboyant character. Tall—six feet, five inches—lean, lanky, easy-going, speaking with a Western drawl, he appears in public in a five-gallon Stetson, black shirts with loudly colored scarves, and a fringed leather vest.

But once inside his revivalist tent, and in the throes of his soul-saving sermons, he is a changed man. Stripped to his shirt sleeves, he is a latter-day Billy Sunday, now on his knees, whispering, now standing dramatically astride two chairs, face uplifted, arms outstretched, exhorting and pleading, carrying his audience upon such a tide of eloquence that they sway in their chairs and roar "Hallelujah!" and "Amen" each time he pauses for breath.

At such times Springer "reveals" the truth about the "Beast"

that is the Catholic Church, and about Catholics in general: they worship idols; they are not allowed to read the Bible; they owe political allegiance not to this country, but to the Pope; they are engaged in a world-wide plot to take over all governments and subject all peoples to "soul-slavery."

For more than a decade Springer was part of the nationalist anti-Semitic movement. But some years ago he virtually ceased toiling in the vineyards of anti-Semitism. The odds were against him, he saw: both because of the composition of his audiences, and because the Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith, the Reverend Gerald B. Winrod, and others—all his friends and heroes—had pretty well pre-empted the field for themselves.

As a relative newcomer, Springer decided to let these elder statesmen rule unchallenged. He turned to anti-Catholicism as a more lucrative way to make a living. The decision was a shrewd one. Springer's audiences are mainly rural Protestant fundamentalists, to most of whom Jews are remote figures better known in the Bible than in everyday life. Springer found it rather difficult to get such audiences exercised about alleged Jewish conspiracies. Catholics, however, were much more real to his listeners: the anti-Catholic arena, too, had more room for a young man working his way up. An evangelist of Springer's talents could instill far more drama into ringing denunciations of the "Great Whore of Babylon," and into thunderous warnings against what he pictured as a monstrous Papist octopus whose greedy tentacles, through its thousands of priests, nuns, and religious schools, stretch forth from Rome to strangle the entire world.

Springer devotes much time to his various publishing enterprises; he speaks almost nightly at churches; he recently completed a triumphal four-month revivalist tour which resulted in a rash of denunciatory newspaper articles; and he began a new project—the printing and distribution of the bogus Knights of Columbus "oath."

This fantastic concoction, which is used by anti-Catholics much as anti-Semites use the forged *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, ranks as one of the most vicious pieces of literature ever used against a religious group. The "oath," which purportedly must be sworn to by every member of the K. of C., runs for several hundred words, but its nature may be seen from one paragraph, which reads:

I do further promise and declare that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage relentless war, secretly and openly, against all heretics, Protestants, and Masons, as I am directed to do, to extirpate them from the face of the whole earth; and that I will spare neither age, sex, nor condition, and that I will hang, burn, waste, boil, flay, strangle, and bury alive these infamous heretics; rip up the stomachs and wombs of their women, and crush their infants' heads against the walls in order to annihilate their execrable race. . . .

Springer's authority for the "oath," he said, was that it had appeared "in the *Congressional Record*." What he failed to add was that it had been printed there in order to expose it as a forgery used in an election campaign some forty years ago.<sup>7</sup>

Springer's distribution and sale of this fake brought about two developments in rapid succession. First, Luke E. Hart, Supreme Advocate of the K. of C., wrote him demanding an apology for "publishing this libel" and insisting that "you immediately discontinue publication and distribution of these bogus 'oath' pamphlets."

Then from Okeene, Oklahoma, the Reverend John M. Berentschot, pastor of the Zion Baptist Church, wrote a troubled letter to "Dear Brother Springer."

About two months ago, I purchased some 100 tracts from you, entitled "The Oath of the Knights of Columbus." This tract, plus some others I ordered at the same time, I took and put in my regular Sunday bulletins for distribution among my people. About two weeks

<sup>7</sup>As early as 1913 a special Congressional Committee branded the "oath" spurious. It came into the news again in 1927, when it was used against the late Al Smith in the Smith-Hoover presidential campaign.

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

prior to handing out the aforesaid tract, I read the whole thing from my pulpit one Sunday morning.

Last week the county attorney came to see me and was investigating the matter, since the K. of C.s and the Roman Catholics of this town were ready to file a charge against some of my ushers for distribution of malicious and false statements . . . I would appreciate some advice as to how to proceed in case they file the charge . . .

Yours in Divine Mercy,  
John M. Berentschot

Springer replied at once to the Reverend Mr. Berentschot:

I want to assure you that our entire church is praying for you in this fight in which you are engaged with the Catholics. I believe it will further the cause of the Lord Jesus Christ . . .

I . . . will go into our files and see what we can dig out . . . I believe they [the Catholics] will be very sorry that they ever started this before it is all done. However, it will take a great deal of prayer and leadership of the Holy Spirit. May God abundantly bless you.

A week later, a much sadder but still loyal Mr. Berentschot wrote Springer:

It is with deep regret that I must report to you that the case in which I was involved was settled in favor of the Catholics because of unsubstantiated authority and misinformation on your part. The printed oath of the Knights of Columbus, put out by your publishing house, proves to be false and without authenticity. I am enclosing a public apology I am making to the K. of C. in our local papers here. Besides that, I was forced to plead guilty to the charge . . .

I trusted the name of Harvey Springer implicitly, and thought anything you put in print was absolutely true and authentic . . .

I am out a total of about \$75 on this whole thing, of which \$25 has been met by some of my faithful men here in Okean. I feel that if you also would redeem yourself in the eyes of many good Christians here, you should write a letter of apology or something to me . . . I also feel that you should, anyway, help towards the expense and burden this has been to me and my whole family.

I also want you to know that if and when the kind of restitution is made that I ask for, you and your work will be exonerated in my own

thinking, and I shall continue to have faith in your work as a faithful servant of Jesus Christ, earnestly contending for the faith once delivered unto the saints.

Yours in Christian love,  
John M. Berentschot

To this Springer replied with the indignation of one who had been betrayed:

I received your letter . . . and was shocked by its contents. Personally, I cannot see why you, I, or anyone else should make a public apology to the Knights of Columbus or to plead guilty to the charge . . . I don't know of any case that has ever gone to court in which a man has been found guilty for passing out misinformation that has been taken from the *Congressional Record*.

I do not intend to apologize for putting out the Oath . . . The fact of the matter is, I am now thinking of printing more copies . . . As to your personal expense, I have no funds from which to help bear the cost of the \$75 which is actually now \$50 . . . I shall pray that God will marvelously bless you in your ministry for Him.

Sincerely yours,  
Harvey H. Springer

A few days later he was even harder upon the hapless Mr. Berentschot. In the March 23, 1951, issue of *Western Voice*, Springer prominently printed Berentschot's apology to the Knights of Columbus, headlining it:

**ROME DICTATES APOLOGY:  
BERENTSCHOT MEEKLY SIGNS**

In response to the demand for an apology by the Supreme Advocate of the Knights of Columbus, Luke E. Hart, Springer reprinted the bogus oath in *Western Voice*—thus giving the forgery still wider circulation—and explained at length the plausibility of each paragraph as he saw it. He carefully included disclaimers, which were palpably insincere:

I am very well aware of the fact that this famous . . . Oath has appeared in the *Congressional Record* . . . and ordered printed

therein by unanimous consent of the United States Congress<sup>8</sup> and is a document which has hurt the Knights of Columbus tremendously.

I do not, for a moment, say it is genuine. I do not know. The secretive nature of many organizations of Romanism is such that no man can ascertain the genuineness of many documents belonging thereto.

Personally, I do not believe that any member of the Knights of Columbus organization in America takes the oath that is reported to be the Knights of Columbus oath. I do believe, and contend, that all the things that are proposed in the Oath have been carried out by the historical Roman Catholic Church . . . I am not discussing the genuineness of the Catholic Oath. I am simply stating that it undoubtedly incorporated the practical policy of Rome and her undoubted demands upon her loyal followers . . . I do not affirm that any man ever took so binding an oath . . . But on the other hand, I do not know that the church that has instigated such bloody torture in her efforts to exterminate heretics and set up her absolute rule over men, would not exact of her followers such an oath . . .

Springer did say, however, that he had discontinued circulating the tract. After another exchange of letters, Luke E. Hart ended this correspondence by pointing out to Springer that while he (Springer) frankly admitted that he did not believe any member of the Knights of Columbus took such an oath, he had deliberately circulated thousands of copies of it.

Hart concluded icily:

I can only say to you that such an attitude is unworthy of a gentleman. It is repugnant to every Christian teaching and it is diabolical in a person who places before his name the word "Reverend" and pretends to be a preacher of the principles for which our Savior came upon earth and for which He suffered and died.

Springer took this in his stride. Indeed, as if to emphasize to the Knights of Columbus that although he had ceased distributing the forgery his anti-Catholic venom had in no way been diluted, in the same issue of his newspaper in which he

"By unanimous consent" is routine form used in connection with all material printed in the *Congressional Record*. It should be noted that Springer still ignores the fact that the "oath" appeared there only as an example of a false and scurrilous invention.

reprinted this correspondence, he urged his readers to buy the book *I Was a Priest*, by the unfrocked Jan Lucien Venet. Springer offered it for sale at \$1.00 a copy, purchasable by mail from his Protestant Information Bureau.

"Have you read this sensational book?" he asked his readers, quoting a number of obscene excerpts from it.

In another issue of *Western Voice*, Springer sank to unbelievable vulgarity:

DOG(MA) RETURNS TO ITS VOMIT

Attention, patriotic, Bible-believing Americans! The Catholic "Church" with its "Papa" is again up to its old tricks. Along with St. Peter's bones it is resurrecting its old technique for changing base paganism into the "Word of God." The latest act of this kind by the Infallible Papa of Rome is to send the literal physical body of Mary, dead these last 19 centuries, and eaten by skin-worms, right into the middle of Heaven and into the presence of the holy God-head . . .

It is important that all Bible believers join together in a finish fight against this terrible "ism." Write today and join the American Protestant League and stand up to be counted among the true Christians of this nation.

One begins to understand the admiration expressed for Springer by the hysterical Elizabeth Dilling, three-times indicted, although never convicted for seditious conspiracy and grande dame of the wild-eyed segment of American bigotry. Exclaimed Miss Dilling, speaking of "Brother Harvey Springer": "He is one who writes with a pen dipped in blood."

Springer has long been the darling of the leading un-American propagandists in the country. From January 1935, when he first started his own church with less than two hundred members, until today, when his name is known as far south as Brazil, he has subscribed to the same brand of "patriotism." In addition to attacking Jews and Catholics, he has assailed Negroes, liberals, aliens, labor unions, and the Federal Council

of Churches of Christ in America. He has assailed every "enemy" as a Communist.

America's enemies, Springer has asserted, are "Talmudic Jewry, Atheistic Communism, the New Deal, and British Imperialism." Catholicism, he has declared, is more dangerous than Communism. He defended as "Christian leaders" such men as the Reverend Gerald Winrod, George Sylvester Viereck, the Nazi agent, a number of German-American Bundists, and others. He has declared that Jesus was an anti-Semite; and has denounced the Catholic Church as the "Mother of Harlots," and Catholicism as among the "apostate religious elements that will make the 'Scarlet woman' of Revelation, who will ride to power on the back of the 'Beast'. . . ." He has attacked Jehovah's Witnesses as "trash," and ranted about "muggsy old Christian Scientists, I Amists, Unity phonies and others." He has declared that "The Negro . . . in many districts . . . is just a dangerous animal." He has assailed the United Nations: "As Christians, we look upon the San Francisco Charter and know that it seeks to destroy Nationalism, Patriotism and Christianity . . . The United Nations is a stench in our nostrils, an insult to our intelligence . . ." He characterized FEPC and other civil-rights measures as "a species of Communist propaganda and legislation."

He has supported, defended, or worked with virtually every well-known bigot in the last decade: Gerald Winrod, Gerald Smith, Elizabeth Dilling, Charles B. Hudson, Colonel Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, Lawrence Dennis, Robert Edward Edmondson, Court Asher, Marilyn Allen, Kenneth Goff, Upton Close, and others.

Gerald L. K. Smith was one of the first to see the promise in Springer. As early as 1943, as guest speaker before Springer's Baptist Tabernacle, Smith spoke glowingly of him as the "future Governor or Senator from Colorado." Springer, in turn, introduced Smith to his Tabernacle with the words:



"I know him as few men know him. I know his work. I have spent time in his office. I have spent time in his home, and he has spent time in my home . . . I believe Gerald L. K. Smith is a Christian, a Christian statesman that is now combating the political faults of the anti-Christ movement in America."

In the heyday of his anti-Semitic phase, Springer's *Western Voice* was replete with such anti-Semitic slurs as the following:

Givin' Palestine back to the Jews would be o.k. if they'd give this country back to us.

It doesn't matter if it is an individual or a race, when they start advertising their virtues, and passing judgment, it is only a matter of time before they are begging for mercy and next demanding vengeance.

Even if Sidney Hillman could talk without a foreign accent, he'd still be what he is, on account of his ancestors bein' what they was, an' even Roosie can't change it.

Not only are Springer's dashing appearance and unquestioned eloquence admired by those who make up his tawdry circle of friends; but also his ability to raise money is admired. At one time, a few years ago, Springer received an income tax refund exceeding \$8,000—indicating an income in far higher brackets than that of many of his better-known colleagues. For one of his projects—the building of a printing plant for his *Western Voice*—he collected a tremendous amount of money. By 1945, he had not only built the plant at a reported cost of \$28,000<sup>9</sup> but had also been able to build an adjacent structure at an additional cost of \$100,000.

Adverse publicity has had little effect upon Springer. During World War II, when he descended upon Nashville, Tennessee, conducted a whirlwind revivalist campaign, and went on to new conquests, the Nashville *Tennessean* minced no words in stating:

<sup>9</sup>This was achieved only after a number of embarrassing difficulties. While the printing plant was under construction, it was picketed by home-seeking war veterans who protested that they were unable to get houses built for themselves.

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

A minor apostle of hatred, bigotry and duplicity, the Rev. H. H. "Cowboy" Springer has been in Nashville this week, rabble rousing to the best of his ability, and has gone on now to other cities in the South which are centers of war production and where war workers can be reached. . . .

Cowboy Springer has ridden on with his cash take in Nashville, and his bag of tricks to spread a little hate around Nashville (aluminum for planes) Mobile (30,000 war workers) Pensacola (Naval establishments) and Jacksonville (Atlantic shipping). We warn these cities of his approach just as we would warn them of the approach of a mad dog.

By 1947, Springer had come a long way from his congregation of two hundred persons. He boasted that he had a dozen assistants. He could afford to spend—so he said—\$2,000 a month to buy time on two Mexican-border radio stations, XERB and XEG, both heard extensively in the West and South. He could afford to travel to Puerto Rico, taking along his family, to help his good friend and patron, the Reverend Gerald Winrod, establish a branch of his activities down there. He could dare to use the Nazi bully-boy technique, as in Knoxville, Tennessee, where he addressed an audience of more than seven thousand persons. Springer was then fighting the refusal of a radio station to broadcast his preachings. He offered a resolution demanding a revocation of the "ban," asked the audience for an affirmative vote, and then shouted:

"Now, anyone who objects say 'Aye,' and we'll carry your corpse out!"

By 1949, Springer was speaking over a score of radio stations. He was also making a bid for a measure of respectability. When he left the Bible belt and entered such states as New York and Pennsylvania, his appearances took on a more sedate hue. Gone were the fancy shirts, colored scarves, fancy vest. Instead, he appeared in a sober black suit, starched white collar, discreet black tie. He was described in the newspapers as:

Dr. Harvey Springer, prominent pastor from Denver, Col., editor of a weekly religious publication, *The Western Voice* . . . Dr. Springer was a ranchman prior to entering the ministry . . . Dr. Springer will speak on the subject, "Stalin's Most Effective Fifth Column in America."

But even as "Dr." Springer, his anti-Catholicism was not muted. After describing the menace of Communism, he would compare Communism and Catholicism. Communism was "a dictatorship without God." Catholicism was "Fascism"—a "dictatorship with God."

By 1950, Springer could proclaim that one of his pet projects, a 150-acre youth camp in Jarre Canyon in the Rocky Mountains, had property worth nearly a quarter of a million dollars. He was on the air, speaking six days a week over a morning breakfast program.

His speaking schedule was enormous. A typical two-week calendar—meaning a speech each evening at a different church—showed the following:

May 15, 1951: Plainview, Tex.; May 16, 17, 18: Amarillo, Tex.; May 19, 20, 21, 22, Lubbock, Tex.; May 23, Littlefield, Tex.; May 24, Brownfield, Tex.; May 25, 26, 27, Forth Worth, Tex.; May 28, Decatur, Tex.; May 29, Monahans, Tex.

At the same time, his *Western Voice* continued its ugly work. It attacked one of Springer's favorite targets, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. It attacked the Human Rights Covenant at the United Nations. Springer filled its pages with verbatim transcripts of some of his sermons, rich with his allusive evangelical style when he retold stories from the Bible:

"And brother, Old Judah reared back like a tomcat spitting tobacco juice in a bulldog's eyes, and he said, 'Bring the harlot in!'"

Springer singled out prominent Catholics appointed to high Government positions. A typical headline read, "Roman Catholic Named Consultant on Man Power," with the allegation that

the New Deal is "seemingly" discriminating against Protestants in handing out jobs and that "many of the high appointed positions are going to members of minority religious and racial groups." And he advertised week after week such books as: *The Judgment of the Great Whore*; *Why I Am a Protestant*; and *Why I Am Not a Roman Catholic*; *Is There a Purgatory?*; *Was Peter the First Pope?*, and what appears to be a basic stock-in-hand book, "Convent Life Unveiled."

This last was presented as:

Convent Life Unveiled: a Book of Facts. A detailed description of black nunnery in Jersey City. Thirty Great Chapters. Edith O'Gorman, escaped nun, describes in detail the terrible experiences of helpless and defenseless girls within the high stone walls of St. Joseph's Convent. The most terrible revelations ever recorded . . . Read this frightful, heart-breaking story and learn the truth concerning convent life.

For those who wanted further and more scholarly education, Springer had a special offer, introduced as follows:

**DAMNABLE DOCTRINES—WHO STARTED THEM?**

The American Protestant League has procured an eight-page folder called, "A List of Heresies and Human Inventions Adopted by and Perpetuated by the Roman Catholic Church." It contains a list of 41 of the major unscriptural doctrines introduced into Christian worship by the Romanists in the course of 16 centuries, listing the dates these doctrines were officially accepted by Rome . . .

At present this pamphlet is not for general sale, but we have made it available to all members of the Protestant League, including those who join now.

If you should desire this interesting "List of Heresies" and another free tract presenting 19 questions that Roman Catholics cannot answer we will be happy to provide them with your membership in the league.

The American Protestant League, the announcement explained, was "the only independent association of Bible-believing Protestants . . . limited to Christ-living Protestant indi-

viduals who (1) want to know more about why they are Protestants (2) want to repress the underhanded political efforts of Romanists in America in order to preserve our Christian freedom (3) want to be better fitted by a knowledge of Catholic beliefs to win their Roman Catholic friends and relatives to a true and saving knowledge of Christ."

Springer, of course, does not represent Baptist thought, although he is of the sect. He might be dismissed as a mountebank, but behind his calliope approach to religion, he has shrewdness and hard-mindedness. Gerald Winrod says of him: "If at times he appears blunt and ruthless in denouncing evil, he is just being himself. If on other occasions, his public speech develops a wooing note that fills every eye in the audience with tears, he is just being himself. If he walks into the pulpit wearing boots, garbed in a flaming shirt and flowing tie, carrying a five-gallon hat in his hand, he is just being himself. He is a hard worker, a deep student, an original thinker . . . He is not on the defensive . . . He carries the struggle into the camp of the enemy . . . It was a good day for evangelism in this country when Harvey H. Springer climbed down from the saddle in Wyoming to enter the Christian ministry." The Reverend Mr. Winrod, apostle of hate for many years, and expert in the use of the cloth to foster prejudice, knows ability in the field when he sees it.

Springer is different from Harrison Parker. Selling the same ugly commodity, he brings to bear a more dramatic kind of salesmanship: personal appeal, evangelical exhortations, the carefully contrived impression of a gallant knight fighting evil against tremendous odds. So doing, he has managed to draw large numbers of unthinking or uneducated persons with him. Harvey Springer has found that demagoguery mixed with pseudo-religion pays off.

*Edward James Smythe* Edward James Smythe also abuses the good name of Protestantism, using equal parts of alcoholism and irrationality to sustain his campaign of religious hatred. A self-styled publicity and newspaper man, now nearing seventy, Smythe is a burly, unkempt figure with a rambunctious air, and a penchant for founding paper organizations as fronts for his various projects. He sells anti-Catholic books and leaflets and conducts direct-mail appeals for money. In 1941 he was denounced in Congress for this activity; he and his organizations were characterized as representative of the "worst forms of un-Americanism operating an anti-Catholic and anti-Jewish racket." Later he was indicted and tried for sedition. Public records document the charge that he was an early collaborator of the German-American Bund and the Ku Klux Klan, that he was in communication with the Nazi party and that he distributed in this country large amounts of German-printed Nazi propaganda material.

Smythe is both anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic. But in recent years his target has become primarily Roman Catholics—and the Roman Catholic Church.

In his early pro-Nazi period, Smythe was the author of such observations as: "Nazism was Protestantism in action, the highest form of Christianity," and "Hitler was a great Christian leader . . . a second Jesus Christ." Now, his leaflets carry such warnings as:

"The Roman Catholic Political Hierarchy . . . is working night and day to make Protestant America their seat of Empire. When that day arrives . . . you will be on the same status as an African black man . . ."

Recently Smythe resolved a curious dilemma that had apparently been troubling him for some time: which represented a greater menace to the United States—Communism or Catholicism? An incident in New Orleans in May 1951 resolved the question for him. A citizen of that city joined by five Protestant

ministers had sued to force the city to remove a statue of Mother Cabrini, a Catholic saint, which had been erected in a public place by the Order of the Alhambra, an affiliate of the Knights of Columbus.

Judge Louis H. Yarrut ruled that the statue need not be removed. He cited the traditional principles of religious liberty which have always marked America as a democracy.

Smythe, writing from his offices at 1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., under one of his many letterheads, "Protestant Statesman & Nation," sent a vicious letter to the jurist.

"Like all Jews," Smythe wrote, "you play to the side that are in power against the minority, denying to them the very rights which you yourselves as an 'outcast minority' clamor for yourselves all over the world." He added:

The bloody history of the Roman Catholic State is only too well known to every student of history. We want no part of the Roman Catholic machine in any part of this country. While this organization [Protestant Statesman & Nation] has fought Jewish-Communism over a long period of years, we do not hesitate to tell you that if we were compelled to take our choice between those two forms of international slavery, we would gladly accept Communism as the lesser of two evils.

And he concluded:

We are offering our services to this group of Protestant clergymen and will bring down there a committee of America's most outstanding legal minds, to appeal your decision, and to seek your removal from public office as a stupid and ignorant, if not in fact a mentally corrupt official who has no moral and/or no patriotic right to preside in a court of law, especially in this country.

Needless to say Smythe's services were not accepted. No committee of "America's most outstanding legal minds" was brought to New Orleans. No attempt was made to seek Judge Yarrut's removal. Smythe himself had long since been repudi-

ated by legitimate Protestant organizations as a fanatic racketeer and hate-monger who lives in a dream world peopled by members of the score of organizations he has "founded."<sup>10</sup>

The Dies Committee listed Smythe's Protestant War Veterans of the U.S. as a fascist organization similar to Pelley's Silver Shirts, Fritz Kuhn's German-American Bund, and Deatherage Knights of the White Camelia. The New York Protestant Council declared that Smythe's private organization "has no connection with the established Protestant life and organizations of the nation." Despite all this, Smythe was able to persuade the Washington, D.C., telephone company to give him "National 1776" as a telephone number.

Smythe came originally from Chicago, where he had worked briefly for a railroad. He claims to have served with the 27th Infantry of the Canadian Army in World War I, and to have been discharged in 1917. His first appearance on the public scene came on April 2 of that year, when he was brought before the General Sessions Court in New York City, charged with grand larceny. He was acquitted. Three years later he appeared in Magistrate's Court, charged with felonious assault, but the case was dismissed.

<sup>10</sup>A list of these organizations, in the name of which Smythe has raised thousands of dollars throughout the years, includes: Buddies Club, 1922; National Democratic Bureau and National Democratic Publicity Bureau, 1927; National Hoover-for-President League, 1928; Protestant Civic Welfare Federation, 1934; American Order of '76, 1934; Association of Republican Clubs, 1934; National Committee Against Communism, 1937; Protestant War Veterans of the U.S., Inc., 1938; *Our Common Cause*, 1942; National Council for Civil Liberties, 1943; Protestant Chaplains Association, 1938; Protestant Service Men's Club, 1944. "Affiliated" with the Protestant War Veterans, Smythe's chief front, and at the same address, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., are these which Smythe has created in the last few years: *Protestant News Service*; Protestant War Veterans Memorial Fund; Committee for Nation-wide Day of Prayer; Commission to Investigate Communism and All Other Un-American Activities; Loyal Legion & Commandery of the Protestant War Veterans of the U.S.; Protestant Gold Star Mothers; Ladies' Auxiliary of the Protestant Veterans; Sons & Daughters of Protestant Veterans; Protestant Loyal Legion of the U.S.; Protestant Fife & Drum Corps of the U.S.; Protestant Church Boys' Brigade of the U.S.



On April 13, 1922, Edward James Smythe was committed for observation to Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore. He was discharged after a physician there expressed his opinion, for the record, that Smythe was suffering from a psychoneurosis. That same year, in Baltimore, Smythe organized his first known group—the Buddies Club—and appointed himself “superintendent.”

In 1926, he established headquarters in New York and blossomed out as a “public relations” man and “promoter.” One of his first promotions was a drive for \$250,000, ostensibly for tuberculosis sufferers. This was short-lived: the District Attorney of New York began an investigation, and Smythe promptly lost interest in the scheme. In late 1927 he founded his National Democratic Bureau and National Democratic Publicity Bureau, at 311 Madison Ave., New York City. On January 4, 1928, he was arrested on a grand larceny charge. Police searched his office and found an extensive mailing list of registered Democrats.

The Court sent him to the psychopathic ward at Bellevue Hospital, which, after examination, released him. The charges against him were ultimately dismissed. A few months later, Smythe organized the National Hoover-for-President League, which was immediately repudiated by the Republican Party.

Smythe popped up in the news time and again. In 1935, he urged the German Government to demand the release of Bruno Hauptmann, kidnapper of the Lindbergh baby, on the ground that Hauptmann was the victim of “the hatred of American Jews.” In 1937, as chairman of his paper organization National Committee Against Communism, he called a mass meeting to protest the anti-Nazi utterances of the late Mayor LaGuardia of New York. Smythe predicted a coming revolution in this country to “give it back to Americans and Christians.”

With great fanfare he announced the creation of his major organization, the Protestant War Veterans of the U.S., Inc., opening offices in Washington, D.C., with Norman Springfellow

Bowles, a disbarred attorney who had served two terms in Federal prisons.

During World War II, Smythe became an intimate of Kurt Mertig, who headed the Citizens Protective League and the German-American Republican League in New York City. Both these organizations, with Smythe's, were listed as subversive by the U.S. Attorney General.

No whit rebuffed, Smythe was very active now, speaking against the Roosevelt administration, agitating at dozens of various hate meetings, but experiencing increasing difficulties because of his drinking. There were attempts to oust him from at least one organization because of charges by his colleagues that he was continuously drunk. In his sober—or more sober—moments, however, Smythe cut a sufficiently wide swath to find himself, on July 21, 1942, indicted with twenty-seven others by the Government for alleged conspiracy to undermine the morale of the armed forces. Among those indicted with him were some of the most notorious propagandists and Axis defenders of the day, including William Dudley Pelley, George Sylvester Viereck, Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, Colonel Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, Gerald B. Winrod, Robert Edward Edmondson, and James C. True.

When the sedition trial opened in Washington on April 16, 1944, Smythe's whereabouts were unknown. The FBI undertook a nation-wide hunt and caught up with him in Ausable Forks, New York, two days later, as he was preparing to cross the border into Canada. The trial was held, but after many delays it came to an abrupt end in December 1946, owing to the death of the presiding judge.

Meanwhile, Smythe had come under investigation from other sources. On March 29, 1945, the U.S. Secret Service requested that the New York Police Department investigate the Protestant Chaplains Association, after charges had been made that the Association was fraudulent.

The investigators uncovered a bizarre story. The Association and an adjunct called the Protestant Service Men's Club were both found in a partitioned room at 251 West 57th Street, New York City. The front part of the room was occupied by one Edwin Banta, a former member of the Communist Party, and by a receptionist. The back part was occupied by Edward James Smythe, together with a gentleman who called himself the Right Reverend A. Lowande, and an unnamed, blond young woman.

The Right Reverend A. Lowande turned out to be a curious person. Smythe had founded the Protestant Chaplains Association in Washington back in 1938. It was described in its incorporation papers as "an association of Protestant Clergymen to act as a charitable welfare and benevolent unit of, and in conjunction with, the Protestant War Veterans of the U.S., Inc., throughout the United States and its territories."

To give this organization an air of respectability, Smythe had searched for a duly ordained clergyman to act as its ostensible head. He finally found the man he sought in a bareback rider in a circus, who possessed a benign and spiritual countenance. His name was Alexander A. Lowande, and he claimed to be a senior bishop of the United Christian Church, a small sect affiliated with the United Brethren, a respected Pennsylvania religious organization founded in 1864. Lowande, however, could furnish no proof that he was a duly ordained bishop. Smythe thereupon ordained him one, with the title of "Right Reverend" and generously gave him the additional title of "Deputy Chief Chaplain of the Association." One of Lowande's special tasks was to write anti-Semitic letters to important public figures, signing them as "Bishop of the Protestant Chaplains Association."

Smythe now began to show his anti-Catholic bias more openly. What he had previously written to friends about the "trickiness" of the Catholic Church, he now incorporated into

one of his frequent *Open Letters to the American People*. This read:

The greatest fighters for LIBERTY in any country of the world are Protestants. This is a Protestant Country. May God always keep it Protestant. We want NO ROMAN, NOR JEW RULE HERE . . .

Smythe sold his *Open Letters* at \$5.00 a hundred. The proceeds were small, and he turned to a new technique for raising money. He hired salesmen to sell printed booklets containing texts of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and benefits under the G.I. Bill of Rights. He charged \$35 a hundred for these. His salesmen told merchants that the booklets would carry their business imprint and could be distributed to win good will. This venture did not go far, for copies of both documents could be had free from the Government.

Smythe next began to peddle "Victory Stamps." These showed a cross superimposed upon the American flag, and bore the words "For God and Country." His salesmen were entitled to keep forty cents of every dollar. Exposed as a racket, this project, too, had a short life.

In 1948, Smythe returned to the anti-Catholic campaign with renewed vigor. A bulletin of his organization, called The Protestant War Veterans—Committee on National Security, proclaimed:

**REGISTER ALL BISHOPS—PRIESTS AND NUNS—AS ALIEN AGENTS OF A FOREIGN POWER, SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE MUST BE—AND WILL BE MAINTAINED.**

He added:

**PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS** are everywhere springing up for the purpose of **ISOLATING ROMAN CATHOLIC** children from other American children, thus inflicting a **MORTAL WOUND** on our **PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM**, established by **OUR ANCESTORS** to the **NOBLEST MAINSTAY OF TRUE AMERICAN CHARACTER**. These Parochial Schools are largely in charge of **Jesuits**, men who by **THEIR VOWS** are **SERVANTS OF ROME**, **ALIENS TO AMERICA** . . .

To a friend in Hempstead, Long Island, Smythe wrote:

. . . you can make some money with me, but I do not have the time to waste on any foolishness, for as a matter of fact I am doing a great deal of writing on these Bulletins, which we are publishing in million lots, and all this means money and prestige to me . . .

An odd twist in Smythe's activities occurred at this time: he turned to the Jews to point out to them the alleged dangers they faced from Catholicism. He began to bombard the editor of the Anti-Defamation League *Bulletin*—a monthly publication devoted to civil rights—with letters containing such observations as the following:

May we ask you who were the forces that persecuted your people for hundreds of years in Eastern Europe? Protestants? Why of course not—period. During the Spanish Inquisition was it not the Protestants from all over Europe that pawned their jewels, took up collections to get your people out of that cursed (and still is) country? . . .

Remember that it was the Roman Catholic Church that founded fascism in Italy, and it was a Roman Catholic (Hitler) that founded Nazism in Germany . . .

These letters culminated in a remarkable statement in late 1949, in which Smythe repudiated all his anti-Semitic activities in the past. Mailed to the "Director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith," Smythe's statement asserted:

I, Edward James Smythe . . . after a long period of deliberation with my conscience . . . direct this statement of fact to you. For a long period of time I have felt it my duty to place on the record my sincere and humble apology to the members of the Jewish religion, which I have so ignorantly denounced in propaganda and letters, which at no time were based on fact, historic or otherwise, but rather on hearsay and irrational thoughts.

Whatever harm I, the writer, have done through my writings against the Jewish people, I shall try to amend in the years to come to the best of my ability and I hereby disassociate myself with all those engaged in any manner, shape, or form of anti-Semitic activity . . .

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

I hereby go on record of denouncing all those connected with anti-Semitic activities in this country as nothing but racketeers and mental perverts.

Edward James Smythe

Despite this abject apology, Smythe continued attacking Jews and Catholics. He distributed copies of the notorious anti-Semitic Benjamin Franklin forgery,<sup>11</sup> wrote a number of typically confused anti-Semitic "Open Letters" in the Dayton *Independent*, a noisy, little-read, Ohio hate sheet, joined in the chorus which denounced Anna M. Rosenberg as a Communist and accused General Eisenhower and Governor Dewey of New York of conspiring together to make the United States a "Jew-Communist Slave State."

In late 1951, Smythe was fighting a mail fraud indictment handed down against him by a Federal Grand Jury in Newark, New Jersey. It had been pending against him for more than two years. He had been indicted on seven counts of defrauding Mrs. Marguerite Commings of San Diego by promising her, among other things, to place a bouquet of roses on the tomb of the Unknown Soldier and to send her a rose that had touched the tomb. For this chore, the indictment read, Smythe had charged Mrs. Commings more than \$2,500.

### III. THE ANTI-NEGRO

The Negro, representing the largest racial minority in the country, suffers greater social disabilities than any other group. The derogatory stereotype of the Negro was first developed in

<sup>11</sup>*Benjamin Franklin's Jewish Prophecy* is a standard item in anti-Semitic propaganda. It is a forgery based upon a nonexistent "private diary" purported to have been written by Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, one of the framers of the Constitution. It was first widely distributed by William Dudley Pelley in 1934, and was later picked up by all Nazi propaganda agencies and given even wider distribution. The Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, the late Dr. Charles A. Beard, a leading American historian, and many other authorities have denounced it as a crude forgery of contemporary German origin.

the nineteenth century as one justification for slavery in the United States. He was portrayed as an inferior racial type, lazy, emotional, unstable, boisterous and childlike, irresponsible, and even dangerous if not kept in his place.

Those who today seek to perpetuate this picture do so despite the fact that it has time and again been scientifically and factually discredited. They have added to the caricature: the Negro seeks to intermarry with whites; he attempts to seize political control by sheer force of numbers; he is the tool of "aliens" who use him to further their own selfish, un-American ends.

At the same time bigotry against the Negro is conditioned by the fact that he does not reach high places in America so frequently as do Jews and Catholics. For more than a century he *has* been a second-class citizen. His inferior status is virtually part of American mores, and it is a distressing commentary upon American democracy that there are countless Americans who accept this discrimination, who see it practiced about them, and who do not protest even in the recesses of their own consciences.

There is the steady pressure exerted by the Ku Klux Klan,<sup>12</sup> fighting with every device at its command against social equality for the Negro; there are the political forces fighting against civic equality for the Negro; and everywhere throughout the country, in lesser or greater degree, there is the struggle against economic equality for the Negro.

On the whole, responsible southern leadership respects the mores of white tradition. When law and leadership refuse to keep the Negro submerged, organizations and individuals quickly spring up to carry out the task. A Negro moves into a white area in Atlanta, Georgia, and a "West End Cooperative Corporation" or a "Columbians" comes into being. A low-cost housing project in Miami, Florida, is made interracial by its

<sup>12</sup>For a detailed survey of Klan activities, see *A Measure of Freedom*, by Arnold Forster (Doubleday, 1949).

management, and a "White Man's League" pops out of the earth.

Yet even while these repressive forces are arrayed everywhere against him, the Negro is also the victim of professional agitators who trade on Negro-white tensions for their own purposes. Their number, compared to the anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic troublemakers, is limited. They do not have so rich a field to plow. It is more difficult to persuade the gullible that Negroes are involved in sinister plots, and to build up large lists of paying readers for anti-Negro pamphlets and exposés. The financial rewards for prodding Negro hate are comparatively small. Nonetheless, in addition to numerous K.K.K. leaders who use their positions to make money, and in addition to Southern racist politicians who win public office and substantial incomes on the basis of their anti-Negro philosophy, there are a number of men who specialize professionally in ugly attacks upon Negro citizens.

Here are some of them.

*Joseph Beauharnais* Among the most industrious is Joseph Beauharnais, a balding, mustached, fifty-three-year-old propagandist, who is a leather goods manufacturer in Chicago. Beauharnais holds a place of his own among professional bigots. He heads his own paper organization, The White Circle League; publishes a scurrilous bulletin, *The White Circle News*; and makes inflammatory and rabble-rousing anti-Negro speeches at sparsely attended rallies of his followers.

But in contrast to others with equal messianic complexes, Beauharnais does more than propagandize. He has a program of direct action, on the street-corner, back-alley level, to disenfranchise the Negro.

He not only distributes his hate literature in white neighborhoods, but asks residents to take matters into their own hands. He urges them to sign pledges that they will not hire Negro



domestic help; that they will not only refuse to admit a Negro to read gas or electric meters in their homes, but will also telephone or write the utility company immediately "to send a white man instead."

He seeks the support of white property owners for legal measures to fix neighborhood boundaries between white and Negro citizens. He writes to businessmen and industrial leaders, quoting "statistics" to back his allegation that Chicago business and industry face disaster "unless the Negro influx is halted"; and he offers speakers who will present his program to civic and fraternal groups.

Beauharnais is a relative newcomer to the field of bigotry. Before 1950 he was hardly known. He is an ambitious man with grandiose hopes. He went so far as to run for mayor of Chicago in 1951 as the write-in candidate of the White American Party—another creation of his. The fact that he received a total of 158 votes did not awaken him from his great dream: that one day his League will develop into a powerful, nation-wide, all-white, anti-Negro movement with millions of dues-paying members.

At the moment, because the courts have revoked his League's charter as a non-profit organization, and because of the apathy of most Chicagoans toward his hysterical warnings of the "Negro menace," this long-range objective lies in the realm of fantasy. Beauharnais has never been able to rise above the mimeographing stage in publishing his *White Circle News*. But he continues to sell hate<sup>18</sup> and his plans are worth examination.

<sup>18</sup>Beauharnais played a minor role in the July 1951 race disturbances in Cicero, Illinois, in which rioting hoodlums wrecked an apartment house into which a young Negro veteran, Harvey E. Clark, Jr., sought to move. During the trouble, White Circle League members distributed business cards of the White Circle League to the crowd. They wore crudely drawn lapel buttons which read, "Go, go, keep Cicero white." Later, at the arraignment of more than a hundred rioters, Beauharnais's followers solicited funds in the courtroom. Some of the defendants offered \$1.00 bills to White Circle representatives as they emerged from the courtroom.

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

Beauharnais, in a rare, confidential mood one day, unfolded these plans to a friend. He spoke of a White Circle League legal bureau, to defend members against attacks by civil liberties groups, and to help prepare anti-Negro legislation. He spoke of a real estate department to obtain ninety-day options on white owners' property, so that if the latter were forced to sell, the League could see to it that only white purchasers were considered; or, if necessary, the League would buy the property and hold it pending suitable sale. He envisaged a White Circle police force, to patrol "hot" neighborhoods. He envisaged his own political department, to place White Circle members in strategic Government posts, to lobby on state and national levels. He spoke of his own weekly newspaper, radio station, public relations bureau, speakers bureau.

As for the membership—

"We'd dramatize our membership," he said. "Every member will be given a sign with the White Circle insignia, suitable for the window of his house, facing the street. But he will not use it until I give the signal. Then, on a given day, every member will place his sign conspicuously in his window where it can be seen by everyone who passes by.

"Can you imagine the effect of that? Wherever you'd go, you'd see these signs. That will certainly give the politicians something to think about. They'll realize how strong we are. If we can control the votes, the politicians will do things our way."

In a letter sent to a thousand business firms in the Greater Chicago area on January 4, 1951—after his White Circle League charter had been revoked—Beauharnais wrote:

You probably have contributed to the Negro Urban League and other Negro organizations, including the Community Fund which contributes thousands of dollars yearly to support the Urban League program. NOW you have an opportunity to support the first all-white organization that has come forth with a sound program to pre-

serve our white heritage and to protect Chicago from becoming overrun by the Negro race.

An invitation from you for personal consultation or speaking engagements before your civic or fraternal group will receive our prompt compliance. Your contribution will put tools in our hands to carry out our program. We desire your active participation, suggestions, and advice in assisting the White Circle League to function legally and effectively. You are invited to put your shoulder to the wheel with ours to bring about fulfillment of our mutual program.

Men and women who sign up for the White Circle League—Beauharnais claims they number thousands, but the evidence indicates very few active adherents—pay \$2.00 for a year's dues and \$3.00 for a year's subscription to the *White Circle News*. They are each given a four-page questionnaire with some fifty questions to be filled out, which is then filed at White Circle headquarters.

Some of the questions:

"Do you want a Negro to sit beside you on a public conveyance?"

"Do you believe that the white people are gullible enough to listen to their minister, politician, or educator to mix on the same social plains with the Negro under the pretense that it is 'Christian Democracy' or Brotherhood?"

"Does it irk you to see a white hotel staffed with Negro elevator operators and bell-hops?"

To newcomers to his League, Beauharnais states piously that his organization does not advocate violence against the Negroes, but proposes to "keep them in their place" by peaceful means through the pressure of votes and legislation. At the same time he disclaims any anti-Semitic feeling, but asserts that "the Jews are really behind the niggers, egging them on . . . You never heard of a nigger raping a Jewish woman. They work together."

In petitions which Beauharnais and his followers circulate in the streets of Chicago, he declares: "If persuasion and the need to prevent the white race from becoming mongrelized by the

Negroes will not unite us, then the aggressions . . . rapes, robberies, knives, guns, and marijuana of the Negro surely will . . .” Meanwhile, he continues his attacks on FEPC legislation—in April 1951, sending every member of the Illinois legislature a letter saying: “You are either all white or a race-mixer . . . You now have an opportunity to strike a blow for the self-preservation and perpetuation of the race.”

It was such activities and such statements that led Representative Corneal A. Davis (D.), of Chicago, that month to demand on the floor of the Illinois Legislature that Beauharnais be jailed.

“This man is either a fool or a tool of Stalin,” Davis declared. “A man like this loose in America trying to start a race war is a dangerous enemy of this government. A man like this should be put away.”

Beauharnais may find difficulty in obtaining funds from his sale of race hatred, but he has sufficient money of his own to continue to be a nuisance. As a manufacturer of leather goods, he once did about \$100,000 worth of business a year—now less because of his race-hate activities—from his offices and factory on the third floor of 812 N. Wells Street, Chicago. He uses his business offices as the headquarters of the White Circle League.

Beauharnais was born in this country. He claims to have served in a North Carolina army camp in World War I and to have been engaged in leather specialties manufacture and sales for many years. He also asserts that he is a direct descendant of Alexandre Beauharnais, one of the leaders of the French Revolution, and the first husband of Josephine Tascher de la Pagerie, later Napoleon’s first wife. From Alexandre Beauharnais, Joseph Beauharnais once told an interviewer, he “inherited” his sense of “racial pride.”

Beauharnais and several of his friends incorporated the White

Circle League of America, Inc., in Chicago on January 3, 1950.

The first issue of his *White Circle News*, a twelve-page tabloid, appeared on May 29, 1950. Beauharnais revealed in it some of his difficulties in getting his message across. Seven thousand persons had joined, he said—he wanted at least a million in Greater Chicago alone—and their then \$1.00 dues, adding up to \$7,000, was \$5,000 less than he needed to keep the publication going. He had contributed \$5,000 from his own pocket, he said, and hoped the people of Chicago would rally to his banner and make such deficits impossible in the future.

On May 3, 1950, he was found guilty of circulating literature “tending to defame the Negro race,” and was fined \$200; he was simultaneously fighting an action by the State of Illinois to revoke the League’s charter because of its “scurrilous and inflammatory attacks on the Negro race.”

By June, the *News* was appearing in mimeographed form. Beauharnais complained that “only three per cent of our seven thousand members thought enough of this organization to subscribe.”

On June 29, 1950, Judge Edward F. Bareis of East St. Louis, Illinois, ordered the League’s charter revoked. Beauharnais responded with a vicious attack against the courts, against Communists, against Chicago’s Human Relations Commission, and against organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League. He announced that he would appeal the case to the Illinois Supreme Court. In the July 10, 1950, issue of his *News*, he appealed for more funds:

White Circle members, we are making a last-ditch fight and want to appeal our case to the Illinois Supreme Court . . . We have every confidence that the Illinois Supreme Court will find that the white race still has a few white rights left. But IT TAKES MONEY—LOTS OF MONEY . . . RUSH YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO US TODAY! HELP IS DESPERATELY NEEDED . . . Our main expenses, such as large lawyers fees, printing and mailing costs, rent,

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

etc., have about exhausted us financially. This will make the Chicago Civil Liberties Union and the Anti-Defamation League happy because this is the way they sink those they do not approve of.

Two months later, the *News* was out again, announcing that Beauharnais had appealed his case. Here, for the first time, the *News* listed books written by other bigots, among them: *Our Constitution*, by George W. Armstrong; *America's Castle of Freedom*, by Jeremiah Stokes; *The A.D.L. and Its Use in World Communist Offensive*, by Major R. H. Williams; *It Isn't Safe To Be an American*, by Joseph P. Kamp.

These books, wrote Beauharnais, "are available through our offices. Write or phone us for prompt delivery."

On October 9, 1950, Beauharnais hastened to take cognizance that word was spreading concerning his difficulties. He wrote in his *News*:

Regardless of the outcome of our appeal cases coming up before the Illinois Supreme Court we shall continue as the White Circle League of America . . . Help make it possible to hire a couple of lawyers and they shall be put to work to help bring about the passage of three laws:

(1) Limit police protection to Negroes who invade white neighborhoods to seventy-two hours; (2) Stop further influx of Negroes into Chicago until adequate housing is provided for those now in Chicago . . . (3) Abolish the HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION—which causes racial tensions and pushes Negroes into the white social spheres . . .

In December, Beauharnais began appealing to business firms and organizations to help his cause. He printed for their information a black list of race-mixing organizations. Among these were the Human Relations Commission; the Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination; the Catholic Interracial Council; and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

On January 18, 1951, the Illinois Supreme Court upheld Beauharnais's conviction for circulating defamatory literature. This

concerned one of the two appeals he had brought. His *News* came out that month charging that his trial was a farce and declaring that he would take the case to the United States Supreme Court. He appealed to the United States Supreme Court—where a decision in the case is now pending—and again there was a frantic plea for money.

When the Illinois Supreme Court on March 22 ruled against Beauharnais's second appeal and confirmed the revocation of his charter, he immediately proclaimed the establishment of a new political party, The White American Party.

He claimed that in four days he managed to obtain 49,800 signatures on a petition—more than half of the 82,900 signatures necessary to put his name on the official ballot as independent candidate for mayor. He asked his readers to write in his name and vote for him on an all-white, anti-Negro platform.

What happened thereafter is reflected in his April 16, 1951, issue of the *White Circle News*:

ELECTIONS STILL DISHONEST! Joseph Beauharnais received 186 votes in fifteen wards as write-in candidate for Mayor of Chicago on April 3, 1951. If YOU live in any of the following wards and voted for Beauharnais, please notify our office as no votes were reported in these wards . . . There is a difference of 18,903 votes . . . these votes must have been for Beauharnais . . .

He charged that none of the Chicago dailies and only one of the Negro newspapers in Chicago printed a news release dealing with his candidacy.

As for the revocation of his charter, Beauharnais took what solace he could. He wrote:

We are a Corporation no longer and are now FREED from the RACE-MIXERS using the STATE as a club to persecute us and destroy our noble aims so that they can have "THE GREEN LIGHT" to mongrelize the white people.

There is no question that Beauharnais has had a difficult time of it. He has developed no mass support for his League. He

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

takes advantage of incidents such as the Cicero riot—to pretend that he is responsible for them. He provides a rallying point for other hate-mongers and he promotes and sells their publications. They know they can count upon him to stir up anti-Negro trouble in Chicago whenever the occasion warrants it. Beauharnais believes that he can use racial animosity to lift himself into political power. The fact that he has been unsuccessful so far is an encouraging augury; but Beauharnais continues to feed the fires of fanatic white-supremacists. To that degree he represents a potential danger in a tense situation.

*Judge George W. Armstrong* Judge George W. Armstrong of Natchez, Mississippi, has his own plan for disenfranchising the Negro. A hard-bitten, crusty old man of eighty-four, with a long and unsavory record of anti-Semitism and neo-fascism, Armstrong spends much of his time championing the repeal of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments to the Constitution. These are the amendments which guarantee equal rights to the Negro.

Armstrong maintains that these amendments were foisted upon the American people after the Civil War by the concerted efforts of the "Zionists" and the Negroes, "led by the Negro lover, clubfooted Thaddeus Stevens, [*sic*] who lived with a Negro woman and lies buried by her side in a Negro grave."

When Armstrong is not attacking the "Zionists," he is vigorously denouncing such men as President Truman,<sup>14</sup> General Lucius Clay, and National Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson as "Zionist stooges" or "traitors."

Armstrong might be dismissed as a disgruntled crackpot but for three reasons: his center of activities is the South and Southwest, where his white-supremacy crusade is given a semi-re-

<sup>14</sup>One of Armtsrong's more restrained comments: "I don't know if Harry Truman is a Jew or not. He looks like one and acts like one. He was selected for vice president by the socialist Jew, Franklin Roosevelt."



spectable hearing; he is an indefatigable and articulate pamphleteer; and he possesses a huge personal fortune which he devotes to his causes.

The first agency he created to carry on his divisive work was the Judge Armstrong Foundation, of Fort Worth, Texas. Chartered in 1945 to "support charitable, religious, and educational undertakings," it has published a continuous stream of anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and anti-democratic books and pamphlets. Armstrong, in a boastful and expansive mood, declared that he had designated "one million dollars for the publication and distribution" of one booklet alone—*World Empire*. This is a sensational compilation of anti-Semitic libels pilfered from the fabricated *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, with a few gutter additions taken from the obscene sheet of the late Julius Streicher—*Der Stürmer*. But there is nothing in the scope of its distribution to indicate that one million dollars—or even one hundredth of that fantastic sum—has ever been spent to promote it by Armstrong or anyone else.

In 1950, the Armstrong Foundation published a pamphlet which illustrated typical Armstrong thinking, particularly with reference to the Negro:

#### THE ZIONISTS AND NEGROES SEEK TO COMMUNIZE AMERICA

The 14th and 15th Amendments now plague us. There is a well-organized and financed campaign to communize America through the foreign and Negro vote. The Truman administration is seeking to bypass and destroy our immigration quota system and the Negro is being transplanted from the South to the North, where under Communist teaching and promise of loot he soon becomes a Communist. They are congregating in the pivotal states with large electoral votes, viz: New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, California, Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois. It was reported by the press that 200,000 Negroes moved to Chicago in the year 1948 . . .

The Communists have promised to give the Negroes the southern states. That is also the program of the Zionists, and appears also to be the program of President Truman. In his recent manifesto on the

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

subject, he reaffirms his civil rights program and endorses the policy of the housing authority to refuse government financing where segregation prevails. It means that poor white people, who need government aid, must dwell with Negroes in order to get it. It means Negro social equality, the mongrelization of the races, the degradation of the Anglo-Saxon race. That is the Zionist-Communist plan for communizing America.

Armstrong makes no bones about this bigotry. He has declared:

I am superior by blood and inheritance to any and every man of African or Asiatic ancestry. The Anglo-Saxon race is superior to every other race. We are God's chosen people. We have created this Christian civilization which we enjoy and have created this Christian government without the help of Jews or Negroes. If this is bigotry, then I am a bigot, but I regard it as pride of blood and ancestry . . .

Elsewhere, in attacking the Negro people, he declared:

A Negro spokesman appearing before a Senate committee threatened "civil disobedience" if Negroes are drafted. When reminded that this might be treason, he replied that Negroes would take their chances on that . . .

Leave the [Negroes] out of the draft and they will yell "racial discrimination." They are poor soldiers and we don't need them or want them; they can be helpful on the farm but not in the army. The government has spoiled the Negro as a farmer and failed to make a soldier of him. It has paid him and his dependents a living wage and most of them refuse to work. The war has been a picnic for the Negro.

In 1951, a new Armstrong front appeared, the Texas Educational Association. Armstrong apparently created this because of the ill repute of his Armstrong Foundation, which received nation-wide censure in 1949 when Armstrong, in its name, sought to bestow an estimated \$50,000,000 worth of oil lands upon Jefferson Military College in Mississippi if the institution would teach white supremacy.

The director of the new Texas Educational Association

---

turned out to be retired Major General George Van Horn Mosely. Mosely is the politically discredited anti-Semitic military officer who, according to the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1940, saw himself as the leader of native Nazi and fascist groups to power in this country.

The first institution to open its doors to the Texas Educational Association was Piedmont College in Georgia, whose president and board of directors accepted a contribution of "\$500 a month for an indefinite period." Despite protests from alumni, students, and faculty, the college administration refused to back down, insisting that the gift had been made with "no strings attached." But as Ralph McGill, editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, and one of the eloquent liberal voices of the South, declared, it was impossible to accept alms from Armstrong ". . . without strings. To take it is to condone covertly his beliefs."

Armstrong's Piedmont College adventure is but one of his attempts to make his influence felt. During the last presidential campaign he paid for political newspaper advertising in support of the Dixiecrats. His appeals were heavily larded with anti-Semitic and anti-Negro prejudice. Governor J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, the Dixiecrat presidential candidate, found it necessary to repudiate Armstrong. In a letter in the *Fort Worth Star Telegram*, Governor Thurmond declared: "I have no option but categorically to repudiate the attempt in the name of the party whose candidate I am to appeal to religious and racial prejudice."

Interestingly enough, two of the books highly recommended by Joseph Beauharnais and by the bustling Helen Lasell are Armstrong's *Our Constitution* and *World Empire*. Others who give wide publicity to Armstrong's obsessions are his good friend Gerald L. K. Smith, who has been his house guest; Conde McGinley; Marilyn Allen; and the *American Klansman*, publication of the K.K.K.

Discredited though Armstrong has been, he is an effective

troublemaker who perpetuates racial myths. "God has been good to me," he wrote in one of his more recent pamphlets. "He has given me a long and active life, splendid health, and considerable wealth, which I wish to devote to His service. I earnestly hope that it may have been useful in restoring constitutional government and in preserving our great Christian civilization . . ."

*Frank Ellison Best and John W. Hamilton* Two lesser-known agitators against Negroes are to be found in Indianapolis and St. Louis. In Indianapolis, a lone prophet among the Negro baiters is Frank Ellison Best, the sixty-seven-year-old president of the Best Universal Lock Co.

Best is a successful businessman who is now spending his money to invoke hate against the Negroes. Ultimately, he hopes to solve the "Negro problem" by an ingenious scheme of his own. His attitude, on the face of it, is more benevolent than Beauharnais's, for Best declares that he is thinking of the Negroes' own welfare: he would help them by resettling millions of young American Negro couples in a forty-ninth state, which the United States Government would establish in Africa, after proper study of that continent to find the most suitable area.

Best has an inventive turn of mind: he has devised numerous improvements in locks, and it is possible that this success in capitalizing on ideas which originally seemed harebrained to his friends has given him unshakable confidence in himself and in his schemes. He claims he has discovered the cause and cure of old age and has solved the "riddle of the Universe." In 1948, he spent a considerable sum to promote himself as a candidate for President of the United States on a platform which included his fantastic solution for Negro prejudice. As he explains his panacea for all the ills that beset the Negro people:

My "Back to Africa" plan is on an absolutely voluntary basis for the young married couples of the Negro race . . . By making desirable

homesteads available to young Negroes at the time of their marriage, we can induce the great majority of them to go and thus we can gradually move the whole race at the cost of moving only about half of it, since the older population, who remain here, will die off eventually. Furthermore, the transition will be so gradual and steady as not to disturb the economic balance of the country . . .

He would have the United States purchase "vast territories"—selected by a Negro commission in Africa—from the European countries which own those territories. The cost to this country would be written off by war debts owed us and "in exchange for financial aid to Europe." He would set up a "United States Negro Territory" which would be granted statehood as soon as the American Negro population reached a sufficiently high number. The elective franchise there would be limited to Negroes, and all elective officers limited to the "Male sex of the Negro race . . ."

Build modern cities and prepare modernly equipped city homes and farm homesteads . . . employing American Negroes who voluntarily apply for work on the project. Open these . . . to young married American Negroes who may voluntarily make application for them. The equity in these will be based on actual cost and given gratis to the homesteaders on a basis of four per cent thereof per year of occupancy, so that the complete ownership and deed thereto, will be given after twenty-five years of occupancy. Also provide government loans for Negro business enterprises there.

Best actually was able to get one Negro pastor, the Reverend Warren A. Rogers, of the First Colored Nazarene Church of Indianapolis, to endorse his plan. "I believe that slavery was one of the blessings of God," Mr. Rogers began his endorsement. "For God 'works in mysterious ways His wonders to perform,' so that my people might come here to the United States to become prepared along all lines and return to their native country with the 'know-how' to better enjoy God-given blessings . . .

"My people are not privileged to receive the best of jobs here

and thousands of them who finish college and universities have nowhere to put their knowledge to use . . . I am one hundred per cent in favor of Mr. Best's plan."

A slightly uglier aspect of Best's scheme was revealed when Best declared that the vote in this country should be restricted "to the white race" only. He added:

The other races in our midst will know their place and keep it, and we can make such segregation regulations as we desire, and all will be peaceful. This will be an added inducement for the young married Negroes to go back to Africa, where they can run their own government.

Although Best mailed thousands of copies of his plan to business executives throughout the country, and went so far as to issue a call for a national convention banquet at the Lincoln Hotel in Indianapolis, nothing much came of it. Owing to publicity in the local Negro press about Best and his platform, the Negro employees of the hotel refused to serve the dinner and other Negro employees threatened to quit. Best was forced to cancel the dinner and convention. Later he held his meeting in another hotel, where the management was under the impression that the event was a Best Universal Lock Company gathering.

Little was heard from Best thereafter, until March 1951. Then he announced an organization banquet for Vigilants, Inc., to be held under the auspices of the Best Foundation, Inc. This, he explained, was a "not-for-profit charitable and benevolent corporation of the State of Indiana . . . in the business of aiding needy churches and sponsoring needed reforms."

In a letter sent to hundreds of ministers, he now called for the "launching of a new unique nation-wide movement among earnest Christian people, in one great all-out effort to PUT OUR NATIONAL HOUSE IN ORDER, before it is everlastingly too late!"

This movement also seems to have vanished into the limbo of lost causes. But Best has money; he knows the techniques of promotion and publicity; he is apparently impervious to (or unconscious of) ridicule; and he has supreme faith in himself and his ideas. As one of many small-time agitators whose influence is limited to a small circle, Best is a troublemaker who can be dealt with effectively on the community level.

In St. Louis, John W. Hamilton, a one-time lieutenant of Gerald L. K. Smith, from whom he broke away, was engaged in 1951 in promoting the Citizens Protective Association. He hopes to build it up from a nucleus of members of Smith's Christian Nationalist Party. The Citizens Protective Association has objectives similar to Beauharnais's White Circle League—to establish a mass movement of citizens to bring about segregation measures and laws to disenfranchise the Negro.

In July 1951, members and former members of the Christian Nationalist Party in St. Louis, as well as hundreds of other citizens, received a letter:

Dear Friends: The Citizens Protective Association would like to invite you to its next meeting Thursday, August 2, at 7:30 P.M. to be held at Albrecht's Hall, 3547A Arsenel St., St. Louis.

The enclosed leaflet will explain what we are working for and why we solicit your membership. The time has come in St. Louis for a citizens organization to unite all White Citizens for the protection and advancement of our city. Unless the White People organize and apply political pressure, our city will soon be completely taken over by the minority group which even now largely control the affairs of St. Louis both city and county . . .

Fill out the enclosed application-for-membership card and send it in or bring it with you. The dues are a dollar a month. You are needed to help fulfill the objectives set forth in the enclosed leaflet . . .

Yours for a better City and State,  
John S. Hamilton, Chairman

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

The enclosed leaflet read in part:

**HOW DO YOU LIKE:**

1. Negroes in white swimming pools?
2. Negroes buying homes next door to you?
3. Negroes playing with your white children in schools?
4. Negroes attempting to force themselves into white restaurants, theaters, parks?
5. Communism and mongrelization being taught your children in school?
6. Your political masters, who were once your public servants? . . .

**IF** you like these things, then you should be happy. But, if you don't like them, there's something **YOU** can do about it. you can join with others like you and get what **YOU** want in St. Louis . . . Join the **CITIZENS PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION** . . . Attend our meetings every First and Third Thursday . . . Read and distribute our literature . . . This is a job for every White Citizen. Do **YOUR** part.

Hamilton's reference to "Negroes in white swimming pools" was not a rhetorical one. He was extremely active in racial disturbances at the popular swimming pool of Fairgrounds Park, in St. Louis, which was the scene of a riot in June 1949. Nine persons were injured following a court order which opened the pool to Negroes. A year later, police stood guard while whites and Negroes used the pool. In the summer of 1951, Hamilton was instrumental in organizing a "protest meeting" directly opposite the park. He spoke from a truck, damned the Negroes, demanded "a return of the black plague to Africa," and shouted: "The politicians won't do anything because they don't want to lose the nigger vote! The nigger is taking St. Louis from the white man!"

Hamilton also reported a victory against the Negro "vermin" when he claimed that he and fellow members of his Association prevented a group of Negroes from "forcing" themselves into a segregated cafeteria. He also declared that his Association had prevented the Board of Education in St. Louis from "turning



over" Central High School, at Natural Bridge and Garrison Ave., "to the Negroes."

In the first issue of his mimeographed *Citizens Protective Association Bulletin*, which appeared in August 1951, Hamilton wrote:

A storm of protest broke in which the members of the Citizens Protective Association were very active . . . The Committee on Instruction of the Board of Education granted a hearing . . . Four members of our organization went from house to house asking people who live near the school to come to the hearing and protest. Some 165 citizens appeared . . . and a number of them spoke against the proposal. We are happy to inform our members that it was defeated. However, we must be constantly on the alert, for the mongrelizers are well organized and will strike again.

Hamilton has begun on a small scale. But he has a record of great activity as one of Gerald Smith's right-hand men, before his split with him. He has been an indefatigable speaker and organizer, and in 1947 was active in Boston ward politics—he was a local election officer—and has been prominent in St. Louis in fighting a city ordinance which would prohibit racial discrimination by hotels. He was chairman of the Patriotic Tract Society and the St. Louis Anti-Communist League—both Gerald Smith fronts—and year after year his name cropped up in one nationalist activity after another. •

Hamilton, who has a long history as an anti-Semite, in the latter part of 1951 began attempting to disassociate himself from the more rabid anti-Semitic leaders. In the fall of 1950, he was still slandering Jews and Negroes, as his remarks over radio station WIL on September 13 indicated:

"America was founded as a Christian nation; America grew to greatness as a Christian nation. Today under the growing influence of political Zionists, atheistic Communists and the constant pressure of Ghetto cultures and isms, we have become a confused people.

"America was pioneered by white men and women. America grew to wealth and power under the direction and through the energy of

### 3 MEDICINE MEN

white men and women. Today, under the increasing agitation for mongrelization and the false doctrine of special privilege for racial inferiors, we have become an intimidated people.”

However, on August 2, 1951, in announcing the aims of the Citizens Protective Association, he bitterly attacked Gerald L. K. Smith, tempered his strictures against Jews, and concentrated upon Negroes. At a meeting of the Association, he charged that Smith had converted his Christian Nationalist Crusade into a personal enterprise; and that although Smith received about \$150,000 a year through the mails, and raised as much as \$5,000 a month at his meetings in California alone, Smith never made any accounting of funds received or how the money was spent. Hamilton then outlined his organization’s policy:

“We are not going to attack everybody and everything. We are going to fight mongrelization and Negro invasion of the rights of whites. That will be our number one goal in St. Louis. There will be no more of this Jew, Jew, Jew stuff. After all, while we know that it is the international Jew who is at the bottom of our troubles, we also realize that not every Jew we meet on the street is in that category. There are a lot of people who should be followers, who believe as we do, and are for our cause, but who can’t swallow this Jew, Jew, Jew line. We have all asked people to join our party and they have answered no—that we are against everything and everybody, and therefore they will not go along with us on the segregation problem. Smith has and is doing the Jews more good than he does them harm by his blistering attacks on them.”

As to the Negroes, Hamilton’s parting word is characteristic: “We believe in white supremacy. We won’t stop until every black in St. Louis is gone.”

# 4

## INVASION

In early May of 1950, a meeting of more than passing interest, but one which received scarcely any attention in the American press, took place in Alexandria, Egypt. Gathered there were delegates to the highest policy-making body in the Arab world—the Political Committee of the Arab League, representing the states of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen. They met while still smarting under the defeat suffered by the Arab armies invading Israel, and were determined to do something about it.

A major item they discussed was one which bore directly upon the civil rights and welfare of American citizens. This was a proposal to establish in New York City an Arab League propaganda office assigned to one overriding task: the destruction of “Jewish influence” in the United States.

The Political Committee was convinced that if such “influence” could be nullified, by whatever means necessary, the United States would withdraw its hand of friendship and help to Israel; that once United States leadership fell away, Israel would collapse on the diplomatic front, and what the Arabs had

been unable to achieve by force of arms would be otherwise accomplished.

Ambitious plans were made. These called for a preliminary expenditure of approximately 185,000 Egyptian pounds (about \$490,000). Egypt, as the foremost Arab state and leader in the Arab League, would assume 46.4 per cent of the cost, the remainder prorated among the other Arab countries. The Political Committee made it clear that it counted upon tapping the following reservoir of pro-Arab feeling and potential or actual anti-Jewish sentiment in the United States:

1. Friendly newspapermen who would slant their stories in the proper direction.

2. Arab professors and Arab exchange students, who could be hired to tour the United States and propagandize as assigned.

3. Professional lecturers, writers, lobbyists, political and industrial leaders (the latter mainly to be chosen from oil interests who have concessions in the Middle East and are dependent upon the good will of the Arab governments), and anti-Semites—overt or covert—who were to hammer away on clearly defined themes designed to make Jews suspect in the United States.

The objective would be to create a climate of opinion so harsh to Jews that, at the least, the United Jewish Appeal and other forms of Israel aid would find it difficult to function; and, at the most, the United States Government would find it inexpedient to assist Israel financially, or stand by its side in international disputes at the United Nations.

The themes to be emphasized, as outlined roughly in Alexandria, were:

- a. That Jews are pro-Russian or pro-Communist; Judaism and Zionism must be equated with Communism; American Jews therefore represent a dangerous fifth column in the United States at a most critical moment in its history.

- b. That this danger is especially serious because Jews dom-

inate and hold positions of power in the Government, in press, radio, films, etc., from which they should be driven by the American people.

c. That the Israelis, supported financially and ideologically by American Jews, are desecrating Christian holy places in Israel, persecuting Christian Arabs, destroying the immemorial Christian character of the Holy Land, and intensifying the plight of Arab refugees whom they had forced from their homes.

d. That the United States, in its own enlightened self-interest, must take special pains to be friendly with the Arab states, who could not only serve as buffers to Soviet expansion, but could also offer oil resources in case of war.

Such propaganda had been spread intermittently in this country, first by the Arab Office in Washington, and later by the short-lived Institute of Arab-American Affairs. But no well-organized, centrally directed, and adequately financed Arab propaganda machinery existed in the United States: this gap now would be filled.

Chosen by unanimous consent as the man to establish this apparatus in the United States, and appointed to come here to head it in person, was the Arab League's founder and secretary general: Abdul Rahman Azzam Pasha.

So far as his selection was concerned, it would have been difficult to make a better one. Azzam Pasha was a key figure in Middle East diplomacy. His status was comparable to that of a foreign minister, but he held far more power for he spoke in the name of seven nations, not one. He rated a formal welcome from Secretary of State Acheson and General Marshall when he visited Washington shortly after his arrival. Moreover, he was familiar with the American scene. He had been here three years earlier, in 1947, and his behind-the-scenes activities then at Lake Success had led a New York newspaper reporter to char-

acterize him as "one of the smoothest international operators who ever came to sell a cause to the United Nations." Shrewd, suave, personable, no amateur at winning friends and influencing people, Azzam was a perfect choice.

But in his appointment there lay another important—and ominous—fact. Behind Azzam, as friend, associate, and fellow strategist, stood one of the most notorious anti-Semites of this generation, Haj Amin el Husseini, the exiled Mufti of Jerusalem. This pro-Axis Arab intriguer had collaborated with Hitler; he had taken refuge in Berlin during World War II, and in a much publicized address over the German radio, beamed to the Arabs of the Middle East, had exhorted them "to kill Jews wherever you find them." The Mufti's role as directing brain behind Arab activities on the American scene was not a new one for him. In 1947, when Azzam was lobbying so adroitly at the United Nations, the Arab Higher Committee of Palestine sent a delegation to seek representation at the U.N. Emil Ghouri, secretary of the Committee, told U.N. reporters that the Mufti "is heading the Committee's strategy directly from Cairo."

The Mufti and Azzam were long-time friends. Azzam, in carrying out his many-faceted mission in this country, would be in constant communication with the Mufti, consulting that elder statesman almost daily as to strategy and action.

Azzam was not to work alone in the United States. At his call here were a group of Arab propagandists. They included Rajah el Husseini, first cousin of the Mufti, and minister of defense in the Arab Higher Committee; M. Wahid Aldali, Azzam's nephew and assistant; Yusif el Bandak, son of the mayor of Bethlehem and chief Arab propagandist among church groups; and a rag-tag assortment of lesser-known Arab newspapermen and publicists. Supporting roles were to be played, wittingly or unwittingly, by various Congressmen, industrialists, newspaper columnists, and radio commentators, as well as by the lunatic-

fringe anti-Semites who found in the well-financed Arab invasion a new source of slanders and inspiration.

So far as timing was concerned, the Arab League could not have chosen a more appropriate moment to launch its campaign. The U.N. General Assembly was to open its fifth session at Lake Success on September 19, 1950. High on its agenda were the questions of Israel's boundaries, Arab refugees, and the internationalization of Jerusalem. Had the League decided to launch a secret propaganda drive in this country at any other time, it might have had difficulty explaining a sudden influx of Arab publicists into the United States. But the U.N. sessions provided a perfect camouflage. Consequently, the largest delegations ever sent here by Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon set sail for the United States. With them came numerous newspaper correspondents and more than a dozen Egyptian publishers and editors. The most important and strongest delegation was that from Egypt, which arrived in New York on September 19—the opening day of the General Assembly. Azzam Pasha's arrival was still three weeks off: but the Egyptian delegation established headquarters at the Hotel Plaza and began to work.

The day after they arrived, the leaders of the Egyptian, Syrian, and Lebanese delegations met quietly at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Their guest was a former air corps colonel who had close ties with one of the larger American oil companies. He met with the Arabs and discussed with them the most effective means of persuading American oil firms to influence the United States Government in behalf of the Arabs.

Also discussed were ways to offset "Jewish influence and pressure on the State Department and White House." It was decided that attempts should be made to show that American Jews, by aiding Israel, were supporting a foreign power which was helping the U.S.S.R., which in turn was responsible for killing American boys in Korea. The gathering broke up with the

promise that a meeting would be arranged for Azzam Pasha—scheduled to reach here on October 10—with representatives of the oil companies as soon after his arrival as possible.

At the same time the Arab embassies in this country began a barrage of letters to Arab civic and cultural groups throughout the country, calling upon them to mobilize all efforts in the coming year “to help Palestine regain its independence and to help the Arab leaders fight Israel to the last man if necessary.” The letters added that Jewish influence in general should be attacked.

Meanwhile, a number of the Arab propagandists, whose activities Azzam Pasha was soon to direct and co-ordinate, were already busy. On the West Coast, Yusif el Bandak, the Bethlehem-born Arab, was busy delivering anti-Semitic speeches and gathering sizable amounts of money from the collection plates of Protestant churches. In his speeches he dwelt on Jewish “atrocities” in Palestine. He presented himself as a Christian leader from Bethlehem, a Christian from the ancient city of Jesus: he oozed benevolence and martyrdom. He assured his listeners that Zionists were Communists at heart; they had made Israel the center of Communist propaganda, aided and abetted by American Jews; and he warned sincere Christians to band together to suppress the Jews not only in Israel, but in the United States “lest they turn your country into another Palestine.”

The Reverend James W. Fifield, Jr., a fundamentalist minister, pastor of the Los Angeles First Congregational Church, and founder of Spiritual Mobilization, gave Bandak his pulpit and radio platform on September 3, 1950, enabling him at one stroke to reach an estimated one hundred thousand persons. On this occasion Bandak was gratified to see in his church audience the husky, tousle-haired Gerald L. K. Smith, no mean anti-Semite himself, enthusiastically applauding him.

At the United Nations, Levon Keshishian, an Armenian on



the pay roll of the Arab News Agency, was buttonholing delegates and American correspondents to give them a slightly varied anti-Semitic line. Keshishian was a former Jerusalem tradesman who, during the beginning of King Abdullah's regime in Jordan, spent nearly a year in prison. For a brief period, years later, he had been a reporter for the Voice of America. To those who would listen, he spread word that the Israelis who came from Germany brought with them Nazi traits: they taught their children to be disloyal to their parents and to worship the state; the Israeli soldiers even marched with a kind of Nazi goose step. He asserted that the Israelis were poor industrialists and poorer farmers and that consequently it was a lie that they were improving the living standards of the Middle East.

Working in another field—on the theory that the best way to destroy Jewish influence was to set one minority at the throats of the other—was Abed Bouhafa, correspondent of *Al Misri*, Egypt's largest daily newspaper. In his dispatches to *Al Misri* and in his private conversations at the U.N. lounge, he pounded on the theme that the Secretariat of the U.N. was "Jewish-dominated." But his main labors were devoted to American Negroes. Bouhafa was a French citizen from Tunisia, of mixed Arab and French descent, a shrill-voiced and frequently hysterical speaker. He directs his anti-Semitism to Negroes. He holds out promises of first-class citizenship in Morocco—without danger of losing their American citizenship—and special privileges elsewhere in North Africa. In personal conversations he minces no words: "The American Jews are snakes worse than Hitler. We must continue to make this clear, and before long you Americans will become like us, the most violent anti-Semites in the world. These bloodsucking Jews will pay for it when you Americans tell them, 'Get out! Go to Israel.'"

Bouhafa, casting about for converts, fell upon a Negro medicine man in the crackpot fringe of soap-box orators—one Frank

Turner. Turner was so impressed that he substituted a turban for a hat, took the name of "Grand Sheikh F. Turner el, Moderator of the Moroccan National Movement," and announced that he had become a Moslem. He gave his handful of Negro audiences a fantastic potpourri of black racist supremacy, religious fanaticism, and anti-Semitism, ending with the exhortation: "We Moslems must help our brother Moslems everywhere cast off the chains of Western imperialism, and suppress all Jewish aggression in the United States and the Middle East."

There was also activity on the Washington front. Issa Korachi, former correspondent for the *Ikwhan el Muslimin*, organ of the violently anti-foreign Egyptian terrorist organization, the Moslem Brotherhood, was industriously giving government investigators reports on alleged Jewish Communists, and what he called the "espionage system of American Jews operating against the interests of the United States." For a short time Korachi had been a free-lance writer for the Voice of America; in late 1951 he had managed to get on the pay roll of the film section of the State Department. His pet project at this time was the creation of an "Arab-American vigilante committee" to deal with the Jewish problem.

In cities from New York to Los Angeles, another Arab propagandist, Kalil Totah, former executive director of the defunct Institute of Arab-American Affairs, was warning church groups that Americans were prevented from hearing the "truth" about Israel. Totah appeared publicly at anti-Semitic meetings. (Gerald L. K. Smith staged a rally in Los Angeles in February 1951; Totah occupied a place of honor on the stage as Smith put on one of his customary shirt-sleeved, rabble-rousing performances—ripping off his tie, gulping huge drinks of water direct from the water pitcher, and making the walls resound with his thunderous denunciations of the Jews.)

Adding glamor to Arab activities on the American scene—which still lacked the dynamic presence of Azzam Pasha, busy

winding up last-minute details in Cairo—was Professor Kamel Selim Bey, President of the Egyptian Hockey Association. A handsome, six-foot-two Egyptian in his early fifties, with the bluff and hearty manner of a North Country Englishman (acquired during his student days at Liverpool University), Selim ranked far above the sundry Arab publicists, free-lance reporters, and odd-job agents, who were busily working against American Jews. Selim Bey was dean of the Faculty of Commerce at Fuad University in Cairo. He was here to set up an Egyptian propaganda bureau, and was *persona grata* with the highest personalities in Egypt, including King Farouk. At the beginning Selim Bey met the public in the capacity of an educator: later he found he could meet a larger and more dynamic public in his capacity as president of the Hockey Association. Thereafter, although his mission was political, he used his sports activities as a means of diverting attention from his “public relations” work. Now he was a sportsman, completely fascinated by the American sports scene, eager, he said, to introduce baseball into Egypt, and always ready to enjoy cocktails with any influential newspaper or radio personality who might enjoy his company.

Selim Bey invariably described Egypt as a country of sports enthusiasts with whom sports-loving Americans should find a warm community of interest. When the conversation veered to Israel—as it usually would—Selim Bey spoke with apparent reluctance. But he always managed to make clear: “We Egyptians must tell you Americans that it really is futile to pour money down the Israeli rat hole.”

In sharp contrast to that of many of his colleagues, Selim’s propagandist approach was subtle. Shortly after the Egyptian delegation arrived, he invited the Egyptian journalists to his suite for a public relations briefing.

He told them to be careful when they spoke to American newspapers. It was not wise to mention “Jews” or “Zionists”—certainly, not at the beginning of any conversation. The Amer-

icans would bring up the subject soon enough. When this happened, Selim Bey advised his listeners, it would be wise, again, to restrict comments to the Israelis—stressing the difference between the “fanatic nationalism” of the Israelis and the broader views of the American Jews. One had always to remember, Selim Bey emphasized, that New York City was the “Jewish stronghold” of the world and that people here had been more or less “contaminated by Jewish propaganda.”

However, once the Egyptian journalists had established themselves in the minds of those they met as moderate and reasonably objective persons, they could begin to drop more and more pointed, anti-Jewish barbs, Selim Bey told them, with the assurance that their observations, no matter how virulent, would not be dismissed as propaganda.

Such, briefly sketched—and without mention of many lesser Arab propagandists, or the beehive activities of Arab diplomats in the delegates’ lounge at Lake Success—was the situation on October 10, when Azzam Pasha arrived in this country and established himself at the Hotel Plaza, within whispering distance of the Egyptian delegation.

Azzam’s mission was one to his great liking. He knew how tenuous were the economic and cultural bonds which held the Arab League together. He knew that seven Arab states bitterly blamed one another for the Palestine military fiasco; that they were divided on many issues, torn by internal jealousies and dynastic rivalries, suspicious of each other’s ambitions for national aggrandizement; but he knew also that they were united on one paramount issue: hatred of Israel. He himself as early as 1948 had said: “The existence of Israel assures the Arab League a long life.”

Backed by the League’s Alexandria decisions, the budget of nearly \$500,000 upon which to draw, and a private slush fund to wine and dine American newspapermen and pay tipsters and

free-lancers, Azzam lost no time. Within forty-eight hours of his arrival, he boasted to Cairo, he met with several representatives of the State Department.

According to the reports he now began sending to Cairo, Azzam claimed he told the Americans at these conferences:

1. That Jews dominate world commerce, and since the establishment of Israel have been trying to seize the commerce of the Middle East.

2. That Jews exert an unhealthy influence on the United States Government.

3. That Jews work hand-in-hand with the Communists in the United States.

After these meetings Azzam claimed in boastful reports to his superiors that some State Department personnel appeared sympathetic to his aims. He said he discussed with them obtaining lists of well-to-do Americans, not publicly known as anti-Semitic but anti-Semitic nonetheless, who might make sizable contributions to the Arab League's propaganda drive here.

In another message to Cairo he added: "My contacts with high official State Department personalities have given me enough courage to tell you that the Department of State will no longer be inclined to take any action which might annoy the Arabs, no matter how wrong they may be. Our shouts and screams have at long last received a favorable echo."

Azzam literally lived, ate, and slept anti-Semitism. He had to pull together diverse efforts of Arab propagandists acting without a unified command, and to work out some of his more ambitious adventures in American affairs and in the realm of international *hohe-politik*. In this period there was scarcely a field of general activity which he left untouched. He called a meeting of Arab U.N. delegates and suggested furnishing them with "combat bulletins" for their private information; he also urged the distribution twice weekly of news releases to the American press, "explaining how Jewish capitalism throughout

the world is precipitating World War III." He lunched with the late Professor John Hazam of the City College of New York, then president of the Arab-American Institute, and a well-known, anti-Zionist lecturer, to whom he suggested the latest propaganda line for campus use. Hazam prepared to deliver a lecture at City College entitled "How the State of Israel was Created Against the Will of the Palestinians." Dr. Fadel Jamali, chief Iraqui delegate to the U.N.<sup>1</sup>, promised to speak on a similar subject at Princeton University. Azzam assigned Rajah Husseini, the Mufti's cousin, to the U.N., to impress upon Latin American delegates the menace of Zionism below the border. He put out delicate feelers in the direction of representatives here of the Soviet Union, Franco Spain, and the Vatican. He was kept advised of the activities of Professor Selim Bey. The latter was negotiating to speak at Town Hall, had been promised several television appearances, and said he expected to have his sports activities written up by a prominent New York newspaper columnist. Azzam consulted with a professor at Princeton, an expert on Arab affairs who was frequently in touch with State Department circles; and also met Archibald Roosevelt, son of the late Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and then head of the Arab section of the Voice of America. He held a reception for members of HELP (Holy Land Emergency Liaison Program), an American pro-Arab organization. They suggested to Azzam that perhaps more effective pro-Arab propaganda could be carried on by a committee of Americans—a proposal which Azzam later saw come to fruition. He made arrangements for a fund-raising dinner to be given by Arab U.N. delegations at \$30 a plate, with money contributions to be asked of all present. He attended a meeting of oil company officials which had been arranged for him by the Egyptian

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Jamali was known for the emotional, violently anti-Jewish speeches he made at Lake Success, many of which in 1950 were either written or inspired by Azzam Pasha.

delegation. The oil men discussed techniques of propaganda and promised to subscribe to a hundred tickets for each Arab fund-raising function. He met with officials of the Export-Import Bank, the International Fund, the Treasury Department, proposing to them ways to prevent financial assistance to Israel and to increase financial assistance to the Arabs.

He concluded this period with a week in Washington, during which time he saw Secretary of State Acheson, Secretary of Defense Marshall, Presidential Assistant W. Averell Harriman, Undersecretaries of State James Webb and George McGhee, a number of Congressmen, and scores of American newspapermen, to all of whom—so he reported to Cairo—his basic theme was that “the only way to save the Arab world from the rising tide of Communism is to meet Arab demands and to divorce the Jewish cause from American foreign policy.”

He had—as he told friends—only begun to work.

Early in November 1950, Azzam Pasha reported to Arab League headquarters in Cairo substantially as follows:

Since his arrival in the United States he had succeeded in causing serious damage to Zionist propaganda in the United States. His operating costs were very heavy and the requirements for keeping up his anti-Jewish propaganda were daily increasing. For this reason he asked permission to draw eighty thousand pounds (about \$176,000). It was of greatest importance that his project continue, he went on, because there were growing indications that the Arab propaganda was highly effective. The principal task before them was to destroy the dominant influence of the Jewish magnates in the United States. This was a most difficult task; it would have to extend over a long period, but if some success were achieved in the first round, the Arabs could command a hearing and hold the attention of the American people.

A few days later he reported to the Mufti substantially as follows:

His first weeks here in the United States had been most profitable. He had even succeeded in provoking conflicts at the very heart of American Jewry—and this was only a beginning. If Allah willed it, he would continue his efforts in this direction, crushing the vicious influence of the Jews much as one would trample a serpent under foot.

At the same time Azzam pursued his activities on the American front with great energy. In Washington he was accompanied by Levon Keshishian, the Armenian journalist, who sent fulsome dispatches about Azzam's American successes to Middle Eastern newspapers. He was also accompanied by Abed Bouhafa, who proved useful to him by shifting his activities from the Negroes to Washington newspapermen. Azzam was greatly assisted, too, by the late Habib Katibah, the Arab "authority" on Jewish organizations.

In mid-November Azzam reported to Cairo an important conference he had in Washington with a high official of the United States Government, "during which I explained at length the position of the Arab League with regard to World Jewry."

Azzam said that he told the official:

1. The Arab world will turn Communist if American policy continues to be dominated by Jewish interests.
2. The Arabs will back American policy if and when the Arab fight against the Zionist danger in the world is supported not directly by the United States "but meets at least a neutral attitude from the United States Government and particularly from the White House."

A few days later, he reported that he had seen General Collins, Chief of Staff. He told General Collins, he said, that the United States would never have the willing and conscientious co-operation of the Arab peoples in protecting United States oil interests in the Middle East "as long as you support the wicked and debased Zionist cause."

While in Washington, consulting with American friends,



Azzam brought up the delicate question of buying arms here. Such purchases were illegal in the United States: Azzam had to move with greatest care. One of those with whom he conferred hinted that a neat way to circumvent United States regulations was to persuade some of the Latin American countries to sell Azzam part of the arms they were authorized to buy in this country. Azzam had to be told no more. He immediately assigned Rajah el Husseini, who had been cultivating the Latin Americans at the U.N., to proceed to South America and work on this project. Rajah was an excellent choice, not only because of the Latin American contacts he had made, but also because of his position as minister of defense in the Arab Higher Committee. He was a fanatic nationalist; he had made many trips to Hitler Germany and had attended a Nazi school to learn techniques of civil warfare. Now he left immediately for Chile, where he joined a wealthy Chilean of Arab descent who had contributed generously to the Mufti's cause in past years. They visited half a dozen countries, organized Arab fund-raising committees and cabled glowing reports of the co-operation they received.

Meanwhile, Yusif el Bandak, already on the pay roll of the Arab League, and busy delivering his anti-Semitic tirades up and down the West Coast, came in from California to report to Azzam for further duty and to announce that he had already made more than two hundred and fifty speeches and was in need of additional funds. Azzam gave Bandak "expense money" and outlined future activities for him. One assignment was to pick up at the U.N. where Rajah earlier had left off—cultivating contacts among Latin American delegates. Bandak also arranged to speak before the Mid-Century World Outlook Conference at Greenville, South Carolina, on December 26, 1950, sponsored by the Bob Jones University.

Bandak later reported that, in accordance with Azzam's instructions, in his address at the Conference he had violently

attacked the United States for its Israel policy, had charged that this country was run "by a gang of ignorant incompetent leaders sold out to the Zionists," and had accused Dean Acheson of being "a stooge in the power of Felix Frankfurter, who in turn is in the pay of his Zionist masters." He had also warned his audience, he said: "Wake up, O American Christians, to the Zionist menace, because tomorrow your country may become a second Palestine. The Zionist menace is a menace to each of our hearts and to your homes. Only through destroying it along with those who support it, can the United States be prevented from becoming a second Korea. Join with us to defeat the menace of International Jewry!"

For Rajah el Husseini, who presently returned from his South American mission, Azzam had a new assignment, growing out of an idea born in the fertile brain of the Mufti, and one remarkable for its sheer cynicism and ruthlessness. Rajah was to ascertain the reaction of American friends to this plan which his cousin had conceived and which—even at this moment, late November 1950—the Mufti and the Arab Higher Committee were beginning to implement.

This was to be a "death march" into Israel, a "spontaneous" uprising of Arab refugees in camps outside Israel, in which from 250,000 to 500,000 Arabs—men, women, and children—would march to Israel. They would walk in, unarmed, with women and children in the lead. The signal to march would be given a few days before Christmas.

Rajah pictured what might happen: Israel troops would rush to the borders and attempt to block the migration. If the Arabs refused to halt, the Israelis would be forced to shoot them down. Arab spokesmen would protest this atrocity before the U.N. and throughout the world. Here, in the holy season of Christmas, the Jews could be charged not only with killing Christ, but now could also be accused with shooting down innocent, unarmed Arabs, mostly women and children.

As Rajah developed the plan, it took on more and more Machiavellian aspects. There were more than fifty thousand Arab refugees still in Israel. The Mufti would see that they rose up too. Meanwhile, his agents were distributing rifles among refugees outside Israel, spending large sums of money to disrupt their living conditions, to block shipments of food to them, and generally to make their situation so intolerable that they would be driven to march upon Israel. Israel would thus be faced by uprisings both within and without her borders; caught between the two Arab forces, she would undoubtedly feel obliged to kill in both directions. Out of the entire affair would come a blood bath that would shock the Christian world, dramatize the plight of the Arab refugees as nothing else, and force Israel into an impossible situation, with devastating consequences to Jews everywhere.<sup>2</sup>

The Baghdad radio predicted that such a movement would begin; but the march never took place. Authoritative sources in Israel later confirmed the existence of such plans, but attributed their cancellation to sharp differences among the Arab leaders as to the political wisdom of the scheme.

By December Azzam and his colleagues were in full whirl, with their fingers in many pies, both foreign and domestic. Sunday, December 3, was a particularly significant day for him: the feelers which he had put out weeks earlier in the direction of Soviet representatives in the United States had at last borne fruit. There is no public record of what Azzam did that day. His activities were cloaked in silence. But he spent the small hours of that night writing a report of the highest diplomatic importance, which he marked "top secret" and rushed off to

<sup>2</sup>This diabolic hope—that in some way Jews would be driven to massacre Arabs, thus giving the Arab world an "excuse" for wholesale massacre of Jews—was not a new one to Azzam Pasha. In December 1947, he predicted to a Gannett News Service correspondent in Dhaharan, Saudi Arabia, that "half a million Arabs" would "refuse citizenship" when the State of Israel was established and would be "slaughtered" by the Jews, leading to widespread bloody reprisals.

Cairo for the immediate attention of all the heads of the Arab governments represented in the Arab League.

The report told of a meeting in the fashionable Hotel Plaza in New York, between Arab representatives, led by Azzam, and the Soviet delegation to the U.N. The meeting, Azzam wrote, was arranged on invitation of Jacob Malik and lasted far into the night. Among the ideas the Russian spokesmen emphasized, he recorded importantly, were (1) the intentions of the United States to declare an immediate war that would crush nationalism throughout the world, especially in the smaller nations such as the Arab States, and (2) the necessity of building up resistance to this American menace by the Soviets and the smaller states.

Mr. Malik, Azzam gleefully reported, offered a deal. In return for Arab support of Communist China's admission to the U.N., neutrality in the conflict between East and West, and pressure on the United States to modify its attitudes in the Far East, the Soviet bloc would offer support to the Arab nationalist movement, giving it such arms and munitions as were feasible. The Soviet bloc would also support the establishment of an independent Arab state in Palestine and would send Soviet technical missions to Arab countries to help them develop their industries and agriculture. The U.S.S.R., Azzam reported, would in addition favor return of the Arab refugees to Palestine and give continued help in the supplying of arms to resist Anglo-American aggression.

Having dispatched this proffer of a secret deal from the Soviet, Azzam immediately turned his hand to reply—on the same day—to an American friend who had written him that he would fight the appointment of Anna M. Rosenberg as Assistant Secretary of Defense. Mrs. Rosenberg's selection by General Marshall had been made public: the hearings on her appointment were yet to be held.

Azzam wrote with magnificent disregard for his own activi-

ties. Mrs. Rosenberg, he pointed out, after all was only one person and there were hundreds, yes, thousands, of Jews working in Government departments. Try to direct your salutary action against all these Jews he advised his good friend, and in offering this advice he also offered the assistance of the Arab League—financial as well as political. His mind went soaring and he hoped thereby to “stimulate” his friend, for after the job was done in Government, he thought that it might also be a good idea to make large industries, banks, and trade unions, areas where Jews ought to be eliminated.

Finally, he urged that the campaign against Mrs. Rosenberg should not be stopped until success had been reached. But he warned against the use of the religious issue. A Red smear, he believed, would be much more effective.

There is no question that Azzam could retire the night of December 3 well pleased with himself. His mood was reflected in a report that he sent to Cairo the following day, in which he recorded that he had been successful in counteracting Jewish influence in the United States by brandishing the scare head of Jewish Communism in Israel, Europe, and the United States. Then he touched on another interesting note—his efforts to negotiate for arms in the United States. He had contacted important munitions manufacturers and had also, he said, received help from prominent people in Washington to obtain arms legally in the United States.

At the United Nations on December 4—the day after the secret Arab-Soviet meeting—a series of highly revealing developments took place. Faris bey el Khouri, leader of the Syrian delegation, suddenly reversed his previous position and declared that all obstacles to peace, including the settlement of the problem of Communist China, must be removed. Both El Khouri and Charles Malik, leader of the Lebanese delegation, who also had been opposed to recognition of Communist China,

in conversations with Arab leaders and several other delegations, asserted that perhaps it would be best to recognize Communist China. The representative of Yemen, an inarticulate figure who rarely spoke on any subject, felt compelled to register a similar opinion during meetings among the Arab delegations. In private conversations the Egyptian delegation indicated that it, too, had concluded that Communist China should be recognized. Azzam, off the record, preached that since Arab public opinion was both anti-British and anti-American, the Arabs and the Soviets ought to be able to get along together.

Matters began to move swiftly now. The following day, during a United Nations debate on Palestine refugees, Azzam called a press conference at Lake Success. It was assumed that the secretary general of the Arab League would make an important statement concerning the Arab refugees—an issue which had become a major propaganda weapon among all the Arab states in their cold war upon Israel. Instead, Azzam surprised everyone by launching into a discussion of Korea. He urged a cessation of hostilities. He called for a meeting between Stalin and Truman—not in Washington, where Truman had said he was prepared to meet Stalin—but at a midway point in Europe or in the Middle East.

Within the next few days significant reports began filtering out of Cairo. For two successive days the Egyptian parliament heard a demand raised that Egypt recognize Communist China—that Egypt negotiate agreements with the Soviet bloc. These were not irresponsible cries set up by any radical wing of the Egyptian parliament: no less a personage than Soliman Abdul Fattah, representative of the Wafd party—the governing party of Egypt—made these demands. They were strongly applauded by the Egyptian deputies.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>The Egyptian cabinet at one time actually decided to recognize Communist China, and Cairo newspapers officially announced that Egypt had decided to

Fattah, according to Cairo reports, said it was stupid to be frightened by the words "Eastern bloc," and that intelligent politics demanded that the Egyptians should use agreements with the Soviet states as "bargaining instruments" with the West.

The Hotel Plaza meeting, held "at the invitation of Jacob Malik of the U.S.S.R." on Sunday, December 3, evidently had been far from fruitless.

An Arab League meeting was called in Cairo for December 20, 1950. Azzam Pasha found it necessary to prepare to return to Egypt. But before he moved in that direction, he completed some last-minute chores. He addressed the National Press Club in Washington; lunched with prominent newspapermen stationed in Washington; and held a final consultation with Arab experts of the State Department.

All these events were publicly reported. Not reported, however, were a series of meetings he held with his Arab colleagues, especially those of the Egyptian embassy, during which a blueprint was developed for a slowly intensifying Arab "cultural" program in this country. Many long-range projects had to be initiated: the groundwork for future activities had to be carefully laid. Azzam's visit here had been brief—little more than two months. But he had made full use of every moment at his disposal; his problem now was to make sure that *the work would go on* . . .<sup>4</sup>

---

recognize the Mao Tse-Tung regime. Only after great pressure, reportedly from Jefferson Caffery, United States ambassador to Egypt, was this decision reversed. The Cairo newspapers thereupon retracted the story they had published.

'Interestingly enough, it was not until October 7, 1951, that Azzam felt sufficient groundwork had been laid for the Arab League to reveal that it had "prepared" a plan for an intensive propaganda campaign on a world-wide basis to meet the Zionists' "hostile" propaganda. The plan, according to the Damascus radio, provided for the establishment of publicity bureaus in the United States, Great Britain, various countries of South America, Europe, and Asia, and the "reconstitution of a purely Arab news agency."

Shortly after his arrival in Cairo in mid-December, Azzam inspired reports in the Egyptian press strikingly reminiscent of the boastful message he had sent from New York weeks earlier: that the Department of State "will no longer be inclined to take any action which might annoy the Arabs, no matter how wrong they may be." The Egyptian newspapers almost uniformly began quoting Azzam Pasha: he had "found sympathy" for Arab aspirations in Washington; American policy, he implied, with regard to such "Arab aspirations," and particularly those concerning Palestine, might be changing.

In early 1951, Azzam began a series of important visits in Europe and the Arab world. He called upon the Pope in Rome to present his views on Middle East problems; he paid a visit to Jefferson Caffery, United States ambassador to Egypt, to lodge a protest against the floating of an American loan to Israel; and he journeyed to Turkey to see what could be done, because Turkey was "getting on undesirable terms with Israel." And he kept constantly in close touch with events in this country, where a number of gratifying developments, dealing with large-scale pro-Arab propaganda projects, were getting rapidly under way.

The earth was plowed by Azzam Pasha; the soil was now fertile. Others who were similarly interested in Arab causes, recognizing that the ground was ready, stepped in and became active. The first indication of these new independent activities came in February 1951, when there appeared a handsome, expensively printed first issue of a new quarterly magazine entitled *Egypt*, published by the Egyptian Information Bureau at 2200 Kalorama Road, Washington, D.C. It revealed, among other things, that an intercultural delegation to the United States was in the making.

In the summer of 1951, a group of nine propagandists, chosen by the Egyptian Government, arrived here—members of an Egyptian Town Hall Mission. No such institution as the Town



Hall existed in Egypt; one had to be invented. The government also had to find a chairman with sufficient prestige, personal charm, and experience as a propagandist in the United States. When the "Mission" arrived on June 2, it was not surprising that its leader and director was none other than Professor Kamel Selim Bey.

Plans had been carefully made for the arrival of Selim Bey and his colleagues—all top figures in Arab public relations and education. They were to visit thirteen cities, from New York to California, and in each city were to be the guests of foreign affairs groups.

In charge of the plans here had been the Egyptian Ambassador, Kamil Abdul Rahim. Ambassador Rahim had suggested to Cairo as early as January that the 1951 propaganda campaign in this country should be co-ordinated through a central bureau in New York similar to the British Information Office. The Egyptian bureau would begin to function quietly through a new organization to be called the American Egyptian Society. The propaganda technique was to include the distribution of promotional publicity to interested businessmen and cultural leaders in the United States.

On April 4, 1951, Ambassador Rahim and Moukhtar Zaki, press counselor of the Egyptian embassy, had met with a group of Americans in New York, and it was decided that the Egyptian mission should arrive here in June.

It was agreed:

1. That the group should be called the Egyptian Town Hall Mission and that its visit must be definitely a people-to-people visit. The U. S. State Department was to be called upon for assistance in all phases of the project, but at no point, it was stressed, was the visit to be sponsored by, or directed by, the State Department.

2. That the purpose of the Mission's visit to the United States would be:

#### 4 INVASION

a. To exchange views with as many representative people in this country as was possible.

b. To hold frank discussions on a people-to-people basis, to the end that both Egyptians and Americans might better understand national and international problems, and might, through personal association, gain confidence in the integrity of the thinking of both peoples.

c. To give the Egyptian visitors every opportunity to see a cross section of America and American institutions, economic, educational, and cultural.

d. To offer as much opportunity as possible for informal visits to American homes.

e. To maintain frankness of discussion and friendliness of approach.

With these terms of reference, it is interesting to note the comments made by Americans—who had no reason to be other than objective—after the tour of the Egyptian Town Hall Mission. The Mission was advertised as nonpolitical and enjoyed the highest possible endorsement in each of the thirteen cities visited.

In Cleveland, the host to the Egyptian visitors was the Cleveland Council on World Affairs. Mrs. Charles Bang of the Cleveland Council later commented in a letter written to the American sponsors:

Our own impression was that the members were very much more interested in expressing their points of view . . . than they were in learning about the United States. . . . We question somewhat the educational value of this experience for them and wonder whether they really care very much about what they found. They seemed much more interested in persuading us to their points of view and in urging us to use our influence to change our American policy in certain respects.

Ben Cherrington, the director of the Social Science Foundation at the University of Denver, one of the hosts to the Mission

in that city, wrote: "The Egyptians were much more concerned to inform us than learn about us."

Even the wily Professor Selim Bey exposed his hand more than he knew. Richard Heggie of San Francisco, associate director of the World Foreign Affairs Council of northern California, gave as his criticism:

A few difficulties did arise during the visit . . . The leader, Dr. Selim, who usually acted as spokesman, gave what our people felt was a very one-sided picture of life in Egypt . . . It seems to me that along the route of future tours stronger continual attempts must be made to develop a spirit of frankness in the tour participants.

Even between the lines of these mild and hospitable comments, there emerges a picture of propagandists busily at work. Significantly, one of Professor Selim Bey's addresses at a seminar meeting in Denver was headlined in the press:

#### **EGYPTIAN CALLS ISRAEL POISON IN MIDDLE EAST**

The American Egyptian Society was formed in April 1951, with temporary headquarters in the Egyptian Consulate. During its stay in this country, from June 2 to July 7, one of the Mission's important duties was to attend meetings of the Society at the Savoy Plaza. The presence of the distinguished Egyptian visitors was for purposes of prestige: hundreds of American businessmen appeared in response to invitations, as well as Egyptian consular officials in this country.

The purpose of the American Egyptian Society, according to the articles of incorporation, is to "encourage and promote financial and commercial relations between Egypt and the United States, to further the knowledge and appreciation of the history and culture of Egypt in the United States and of the history and culture of the United States in Egypt, to encourage travel between the two countries . . . and to promote generally mutual understanding and good will, encouraging an interest in and appreciation of the respective countries."

No anti-Semitism was evident, and Americans who became members began to contribute sums ranging from \$5.00 to \$130. In late 1951, Ambassador Rahim told friends that he now anticipated substantial American contributions—in the \$500, \$1,000 and larger, brackets. *Egypt*, he said, would become the publication of the American Egyptian Society. The magazine would seem less a propaganda publication if published by the Society than if sent out under the imprimatur of the Egyptian Information Bureau. For its first several numbers, the ambassador indicated, the publication costs would be borne by the Egyptian Embassy.

Shortly before the end of 1951, a number of Arab leaders in this country met and discussed the nature of future propaganda activities. (*Egypt* was launched, and apparently successfully: The Egyptian Town Hall Mission had made its more or less triumphant tour; the American Egyptian Society was attracting more and more American members.) The Arab leaders planned a number of personal appearances over radio and television. The principal subject under discussion was whether, in their public appearances, they should attack American Jews.

Some believed that considerable sections of the American public would welcome such attacks. Others thought that such tactics would encounter too much antagonism from the outset.

It was the consensus, finally, that the Arabs, in the weeks and months to come, should attack not Jews as such in the United States, but Zionists. But when speaking about Israel, they could safely say, "the Jews in Palestine."

This, then, is the story of the launching of the Arab invasion in the United States, the co-ordination of activities under Azzam Pasha, the independent but parallel work of sympathetic Americans, the slow but steady development of the propaganda devices he stimulated, and the legacy of racial and religious hatred he left behind.

The authors of this book do not indict the Arabs—or their American friends—because they are pro-Arab. We do not indict the Arab delegates at the United Nations who—like delegates of all countries—are understandably interested in winning supporters to their cause. We do not criticize the Arab activity which seeks to cement relations between America and the Arab world.

But we do indict those Arabs who use religious hatred and prejudice to achieve their ends. We do indict those Arab delegates, diplomats, and others, who peddle suspicion and distrust of Jews to the four corners of the world, and would disenfranchise them wherever they live in order to accomplish their objectives in the Middle East. We do criticize, and strongly, that Arab activity which victimizes the Jew and creates dissension in our country.

We have no quarrel, for example, with an Azzam Pasha who calls upon our State Department to win American support for legitimate objectives. We have a quarrel with an Azzam Pasha who, using his diplomatic prestige as secretary general of the Arab League, calls upon Americans to slander American Jews; who demands that America's support of the world's democracies be withheld from Israel on the lie that she promotes Communism—while, at that very moment, he and his colleagues are making secret anti-American deals with the Soviets.

When Azzam Pasha warns the State Department that the Arabs may turn to Communism because of unrest in the Middle East—and attributes that unrest to American friendship for Israel—he is guilty of a monstrous distortion. When, further, in an attempt to mislead the American people and create anti-Semitism, he brandishes the fraudulent scare head of Jewish Communism throughout the world, he must be exposed for what he is—an international troublemaker.

What Azzam Pasha and his colleagues aim to do, in effect, is to make political capital of anti-Semitism—as did Hitler. The

program of the Arab League in the United States is tantamount to the program of the Nazi-German propaganda office in the 1930s. The objective is the same—to divide and confuse the American people by subsidizing and fomenting religious prejudice. And as was the case with the Nazis, successful achievement can only mean disaster for all. When divisiveness is promoted by troublemakers at home, it is a matter of concern for every American. But when that divisiveness is deliberately encouraged and financed by troublemakers from abroad—when by their propaganda they help strengthen antidemocratic movements in this country—then all of us become the victims.

That is the menace of the troublemakers from the Middle East.

# 5

## NETWORK

It is traditional for Americans to disagree among themselves on public issues, to express their opinions openly, and to attempt to persuade their fellow citizens to their point of view. This free give-and-take is the very essence of the democratic process. It enables the people—the ultimate makers of public policy—to reach their decisions in the wake of full and informed discussion.

There are those who deliberately damage this democratic process. They are propagandists who seize upon important public issues, but who do not discuss them honestly; instead, they twist meanings, misinterpret intentions, impugn the motives and characters of those on one side or another. A basic weapon in their arsenal of distortion is the whipping up of fear and suspicion of racial and religious groups.

These troublemakers are to be found among professional publicists, pamphleteers, lobbyists. Each is set up in business as a self-proclaimed guardian of the nation's welfare. Each has his own organization devoted to the promotion of his views on current affairs. Each seeks to mold public opinion by arguments to which most Americans would not stoop. Each receives

his income from the sale of his pamphlets, from fees he receives for lectures, from dues paid by members of his organization, and from such financial contributions as he is able to collect from those who receive—and believe—his propaganda.

Two common denominators mark these troublemakers. They are bigots—and deny it. They are antidemocratic, with long records as enemies of public enlightenment—and deny it. They usually operate in their own names, sometimes behind the façade of an organization. An examination of their activities frequently reveals actual contact with racial or religious bigots whom they *publicly* scorn—the medicine men, for example, who don't bother to hide behind such words as "alien," "foreign-born," or "pressure group," when attacking Jews or other minorities.

The co-operation among these troublemakers goes far beyond mutual commendation. They exchange "patriotic literature," quote from each other's pamphlets, advertise in each other's publications, and most important of all, help distribute each other's hate propaganda.

This cross-pollination has resulted in a brisk trade and exchange of membership lists. The citizen who subscribes to Upton Close's *Closer-ups* need not be surprised to receive, unsolicited and without charge, pamphlets and leaflets published by Gerald L. K. Smith or Merwin K. Hart. In this fashion a subscriber who gets a twisted version of events from Gerald Smith finds that same version given him, with slight modifications and additions, by the others—and to that degree the lies of one are endorsed and re-endorsed by the others.

In other words, these troublemakers work virtually as a team through a network spread from border to border, and in this sense constitute a nation-wide movement.

To make the picture clear as to the actual co-ordination between members of the network, it may be well to examine the contacts and relationships of three leading members—Merwin



K. Hart, Gerald L. K. Smith, and Joseph P. Kamp. We shall then see how a comparatively unimportant local propagandist in a small town of the deep South can have immediately at his fingertips the latest "line" of his counterpart in the North and far West. This, too, explains how the cheap little mimeographed hand-out of the bigot finds ready distribution in widely separate places.

*Merwin K. Hart* Hart is probably the most ubiquitous of the network figures. He is a registered lobbyist whose activities were closely examined by the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of the 81st Congress, popularly known as the Buchanan Committee. This is what the Committee had to say about Hart's organization:

One of the National Economic Council's techniques, for example, is to disparage those who oppose its objectives by appeals to religious prejudice, often an ill-concealed anti-Semitism.

The American Legion, department of Illinois, in annual reports for 1949, '50 and '51, warned against Hart and others of the same cloth.

Hart has been in touch with Allen Zoll, Joseph P. Kamp, Upton Close, Myron Fagan, Gerald Smith, Benjamin Freedman, Robert Donner, Conde McGinley, George Deatherage, and George W. Armstrong. (He co-operates, too, with Edward Rumely of the Committee for Constitutional Government, a political propaganda organization of extreme right-wing orientation which, however, does not indulge in religious prejudice.) Hart once maintained an intimate business relationship with Allen Zoll. These two signed a contract on January 6, 1948, under the terms of which Zoll agreed to act as a solicitor for Hart at a ten-per-cent commission (plus a twenty-per-cent bonus on any subscriptions which Zoll was able to obtain from his own lists for Hart). This relationship lasted nine months.

A dispute over funds dissolved it, but Hart remained friends with Zoll throughout; and shortly thereafter, Zoll was again lauding Hart as a splendid public speaker and "an outstanding American."

For a time, Hart was also in partnership with Close; for nearly a year he actually sponsored Close's radio broadcasts. More than \$235,000 was raised by the Hart-Close team, but again a dispute over funds led to a break-up. Here, however, ill will between the two reached such a pitch that they almost took their differences into court in 1947. But by late 1949 they were friends again and Hart was once more warmly recommending Upton Close and his literature.

When Hart and Close broke up, a story spread in the movement that Hart and Close had fought over money. Elizabeth Dilling in Chicago was concerned. She wrote a letter to Joseph Kamp asking for the facts about the Hart-Close dispute. Kamp replied to her, but not before submitting his reply to Hart for approval. In it Kamp defended Hart—as was to be expected in view of their friendship—and declared that Close had been "paid more than \$30,000 for a year's service." He added, in this letter to Mrs. Dilling: "Do you know of any other anti-Communist getting that kind of money?"

Hart did not soon forget this solicitude shown to him by Kamp. The Buchanan Committee revealed that Hart on several occasions recommended and distributed Kamp's pamphlets.

Hart's relationship with Gerald Smith is somewhat different. In public Hart is a suave man, meticulous in his language, manners, and appearance. Harvard-bred, he looks the part, and takes pains not to allow his skirts to be muddied by the more vulgar practitioners of bigotry. In contrast, Gerald Smith is a flamboyant character, loud and unrestrained, the sort of man who stoops to the vilest epithets against Jews, who throws his coat from the speaker's platform to the floor, rolls up his sleeves,

rips off his tie, and roars: "I sweat like a Georgia pig when I get going!"

Hart's attitude in public, therefore, is one of distant politeness to Smith. Smith deliberately follows this lead, and takes every opportunity to make clear that he and Hart are by no means intimate friends. For example, in Smith's publication, *The Cross and the Flag*, for February 1950, Smith describes Hart as a "patriot, a student, a crusader, an executive, and a man of great moral courage," but hastens to add: "We have no collaborating or personal contacts . . . I respect him as one of America's first citizens."

But in private correspondence, an altogether different picture appears. As early as 1948, Smith wrote Hart a personal note, in which he said in part:

This letter needs no reply. Because of the highly controversial nature of my work, I can easily understand why it might not seem practical for you to be in correspondence with me, but as you know, I hold you in high esteem and always have . . . The purpose of this letter has to do with your welfare and mine. I am suspicious of the conduct of Upton Close. I have reason to believe that he may be working with your enemies and mine under cover.

Notwithstanding Smith's suggestion that no reply was needed, Hart did reply, and Smith, in turn, wrote Hart again:

Your letter of March 18 has been received. Frankly, I developed rather an apprehensive attitude toward Mr. Close after hearing that he had said some unkind things about you, because you have always enjoyed my profound respect. Of course, you may rest assured that I shall publish nothing. The common enemy must never be let in on any differences that develop.

Smith ended this note with a warm postscript extending Mrs. Smith's personal greetings to Hart and Mrs. Hart.

A week later Smith again wrote Hart:

I am sending you under separate cover a nice, fresh copy of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*.

On November 9, 1948, Hart wrote Douglas Reed, a British anti-Semitic author as follows:

I have no idea whether the protocols are as old as is claimed for them . . . But I feel confident that what was outlined is exactly what is being worked out at the present time. Whether they are ancient or not is of no great importance.

In January 1950, Hart wrote Smith:

I certainly thank you for your friendly letter of December 31 and am certainly delighted that you liked our Council Letter of December 15. Let me compliment you, too, on the untiring courage you have shown in fighting for what you believe to be right. If Mrs. Hart were here, she would join me in sending you and Mrs. Smith and your family our warm personal regards and best wishes for the New Year.

Later Smith sent Hart a letter that he had received, asking Hart to answer it for him. This was done in the same month in which Smith declared in *The Cross and the Flag* that he and Hart "have no collaborating or personal contacts."

Hart's contacts also reach out to Benjamin H. Freedman, the same Benjamin Freedman who played so important—and fantastic—a part in the smear upon Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg. On July 12, 1947, Hart wrote Congressman Ed Gossett of Texas, inviting him to a dinner at the University Club in New York, at which one guest of honor was "Mr. Ben H. Freedman, a Jew who is thoroughly alive to all the mischief and the harm that is being stirred up by professional Jews, especially with respect to the Palestine question."

Hart added in this letter: "In all probability, I will also have as a guest of honor Azzam Pasha who is the secretary general of the Arab League."

In subsequent months Freedman became intimately associated with Hart's organization. He served for a time on its board of directors. As early as 1947, Hart had opened the pages of his *National Economic Council Letter* to Freedman's anti-

Zionist, anti-Jewish fulminations. It is interesting to examine, at this point, how a specific anti-Semitic concept, introduced by one troublemaker—Benjamin Freedman—soon becomes the stock in trade of anti-Semites all through the country. To Freedman belongs the dubious distinction of having spread the theory that the Jews of today are not really descendants of the Jews of old, but are sprung from the “Khazars,” a tribe of Asiatic nomads who are said to have been converted to Judaism in the eighth century. Apparently Freedman popularized the Khazar theory to discredit Zionist aspirations in Palestine, and also used it to “establish” historical proof that “the Jews of today have Russian rather than Biblical origins.” The doctrine spread from *Common Sense* to *Destiny* magazine, published by Howard Rand’s Anglo-Saxon Federation, to *The Broom*, published by C. Leon de Aryan, and it eventually was picked up even by Bill Hendrix, national adjutant of the Southern and Northern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. Hendrix added an ingenious fillip of his own, explaining in one of the K.K.K. publications that the epithet “kike” was a contraction of the word “Khazar” and was so used by “German Jews” when they spoke of East European Jews. In recent months Forrest Sammons’s anti-Semitic *Open Letters*, mailed from his headquarters in Huntington, West Virginia, have also picked up the Khazar concept.

Hart maintains relationships with nearly a dozen other propagandists. Myron C. Fagan, at numerous meetings of his Cinema Educational Guild, reported his co-operation with Hart and read correspondence between them in which each promised to support the other. Hart has corresponded frequently with Robert Donner, a wealthy Denver industrialist who for years has distributed devisive literature. In December 1948, Hart asked Donner to recommend a speaker for one of his meetings: Donner promptly replied with the name of Dewey Taft, one of Colorado’s best-known anti-Semitic propagandists. Conde Mc-

Ginley, the publisher of *Common Sense*, was happy to publish Hart's material. Hart wrote friends he had given McGinley at least one financial contribution.

On several occasions Hart sent hundreds of copies of his *National Economic Council Letter* to the veteran propagandist George Deatherage, one of the most notorious of America's anti-Semites, and one of those named in the war-time mass sedition indictments, for the latter to distribute. In 1948, Deatherage, after sending a mailing list of his own for Hart to use, wrote:

Hope I have helped increase the circulation. Anyhow, we are trying . . . Repudiation of the partition of Palestine can be accredited in a great sense to your work, I firmly believe. Beautiful piece of work.

Hart is also one of the propagandists favored by George W. Armstrong. The reports of the Buchanan Committee reveal that Armstrong has been a large financial contributor to Hart. Armstrong sent Hart copies of his own rabid pamphlets, with such personal inscriptions as "To the courageous patriot, Merwin K. Hart, in appreciation of your great service to your country—George W. Armstrong."

Not only is Hart in active correspondence and communication with anti-Semitic leaders in the United States, and with Douglas Reed, the British anti-Semite, he also keeps up a diligent correspondence with such world figures in international racism as Theodore Aubert, a Swiss pro-Nazi.

*Gerald L. K. Smith* Smith, the most publicly active member of the network, has been in touch with Merwin Hart, Myron Fagan, Benjamin Freedman, Joseph Kamp, Robert Williams, Forrest Sammons, George Van Horn Moseley, George Armstrong, Wesley Swift, and others.

On the West Coast, the Reverend Wesley Swift of the Anglo-Saxon Christian Congregation acts as Smith's lieutenant, co-

operating closely with him on all local matters, arranging meetings for him, sharing the platform with him, and otherwise assisting his efforts in California.

Myron Fagan, who likes to consider his Cinema Educational Guild a purely "anti-Communist" organization, is a propagandist whose attempts to appear politically respectable have been unsuccessful because of his once intimate, working relationship with Gerald Smith. He does not resort to defamation of Jews as Jews but does cooperate with public anti-Semites. When, in 1951, Fagan sought respectable support for his "anti-Communist" film, *Operation Survival*, a letter written by Smith to the late William C. Ring, Fagan's attorney, was made public:

You will recall that I was a bit difficult to see while in Los Angeles. This is not unusual, but I hesitated to be the one to give you the facts concerning the subsidy of Mr. Fagan by Mr. Swift, myself and others, but when one approaches a situation where he will be asked to say things under oath, then the situation becomes serious. Mr. Fagan's files are filled with letters from me advising him to stay out of the courts and not sue people regarding this matter. The simple fact is, the Jew Communists of Hollywood wrecked him. Swift and Bader helped him, and then I stepped in where they left off and gave him a boost with the understanding that I had no desire to control his activities and I did not require that he praise me in public or admit any organic or personal association but naturally we would expect that he would avoid anything that would bring discredit to us.

This letter is strictly personal and is for you only and is not to be shown to Mr. Fagan. If I am put on the witness stand and take an oath to tell the truth and nothing but the truth, I shall have to say that I started the Cinema Educational Guild. I named it, I conducted the first meeting, raised the first money, turned the names over to Fagan and said "Sic 'em."

Co-operation between Smith and Joseph Kamp has been carried on not only behind the scenes, but also openly. At his meetings, Smith quotes from Kamp's pamphlets, praises him heartily, and purchases large bulk orders of Kamp pamphlets for sale and distribution to his own mailing list. Early in 1949,

Gerald Smith wrote Kamp that he had a "terrific" manuscript exposing Communism in Hollywood and asked Kamp's assistance in printing it. Kamp replied to Smith within a week and hazarded the guess that the manuscript was by Myron Fagan. Smith confirmed Kamp's guess; whereupon the two men engaged in long-distance correspondence in an effort to have this opus by a third member of the fraternity printed and published.

Robert H. Williams, the West Coast ex-Army officer turned anti-Semitic pamphleteer, has enjoyed the benefit of Gerald Smith's promotion for his pamphlets. Williams is one of the most vicious racists to appear on the scene in recent years. He is the publisher and editor of a violently written news sheet, *Williams' Intelligence Summary*, and the author of such incredible pamphlets as *The Anti-Defamation League and Its Use in the World Communist Offensive*, *The Untold Story of State Medicine*, the *FEPC and the Minority Machine*, and *Know Your Enemy*. Not satisfied with disseminating his anti-Semitic propaganda inside the United States, Williams has tried to peddle his writings to the Egyptian newspaper, *Al-Misri*, for republication in Arab countries. It is interesting to note in this connection that Williams's Arab contact in this endeavor was Abed Bouhafa, one of the propagandists associated with Azzam Pasha.

Williams was named in *Exposure of Hate Groups*, published by the Americanism Commission of The American Legion, Department of Illinois, in 1949. The July 1951 issue of Smith's *The Cross and the Flag* pushed the distribution of four of Williams's pamphlets, and Smith quotes Williams as "authority and proof" for the thesis that Communism is "being promoted either openly or deceptively by Jewish brains, Jewish money, and Jewish leadership."

Williams at one time had an intimate relationship with Upton Close, even sharing his office a few years ago. Williams's ma-



terial is distributed not only by Smith and Close, but by Fagan, Donner, and the Southern and Northern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. His literature and activities have been endorsed by such other figures as Gerald Winrod, Harvey Springer, Lawrence Reilly,<sup>1</sup> Marilyn R. Allen, Andrew McAllister,<sup>2</sup> and Lyril Van Hyning.<sup>3</sup>

General Van Horn Moseley, the anti-Semitic retired Army officer who has represented George Armstrong, was a featured speaker at the September 1949 Smith convention in St. Louis, Missouri. Smith reciprocated by filling the columns of *The Cross and the Flag* with fulsome praise of Moseley. Armstrong, himself, also helps Smith with sizable contributions.

*Joseph P. Kamp* Kamp has a record of association with an imposing list of hate leaders throughout the country. This includes Merwin Hart, Gerald Smith, Allen Zoll, Upton Close, George Deatherage, Gerald Winrod, George Van Horn Moseley, Robert Donner, and Mrs. Jessie Welch Jenkins.

Allen Zoll, the fascist propagandist and Coughlin supporter, who has more recently popped up as an "educational expert," has had a close contractual relationship with Kamp. Zoll, while he was raising funds in 1948 for Merwin Hart on a commission basis, was doing the same thing for Joe Kamp and his Constitutional Educational League.

As early as 1945, Kamp was in correspondence with Upton Close with reference to possible co-operation between them.

Gerald Winrod, the Midwest anti-Semitic preacher, has a

<sup>1</sup>Lawrence Reilly has been a Gerald Smith fellow traveler and is now the head of the anti-Semitic Lutheran Research Society in Detroit, Michigan. Reilly's venture is not connected with or recognized by official Lutheran bodies.

<sup>2</sup>Andrew B. McAllister is the organizer of the Pro-American Information Bureau in Hinckley, Illinois, a national clearinghouse for anti-Semitic literature.

<sup>3</sup>Mrs. Lyril Van Hyning is the head of the anti-Semitic "We, the Mothers Mobilize for America" in Chicago, Illinois, and editor of its hate sheet, *Women's Voice*.

record of almost a full decade of close collaboration with Kamp. As far back as 1942, Winrod was writing Kamp to congratulate him on his pamphlets, to promise help in distributing them, and to exchange information. Winrod purchased large quantities of Kamp pamphlets, some in lots of ten thousand. In return, Kamp promised to use his influence with Congressmen to help Winrod, who was then having broadcasting difficulties over Mexican radio stations. In short, Winrod's co-operation with Kamp over the years has proved to be close, secret, and mutually profitable.

Robert Donner has an even longer record of close co-operation with Kamp, dating back to 1941. Donner has distributed Kamp's various pamphlets and contributed money to his cause, and through the years the two men have checked on persons whom they consider dangerous. In 1949, Kamp suggested in a letter to Donner that he (Kamp) was the proper man to conduct an investigation of Communism, and asked \$20,000 to do the job. He assured Donner that he would have the use of the files belonging to Upton Close, Elizabeth Dilling, Lawrence Reilly, and others.

Donner in his reply told Kamp of a dinner he had had with Upton Close, Allen Zoll, and Lawrence Dennis. Donner added that he had received a hundred copies of *Behind the Lace Curtain of the Y.W.C.A.* a Kamp pamphlet which charges that the Y.W.C.A. is Communist, and stated: "I will try to get some of them out on the list."

In another letter, Donner wrote Kamp:

By the way, do you get the *Cross and the Flag* (Smith)? The current issue covers the Hollywoodites and their Jews in the companies, as well as the actors and actresses of Jewish extraction and the full-blooded ones which predominate.

Donner in other letters asked Kamp's help in answering correspondence; told Kamp that he had personally given six copies

of the Kamp pamphlet *Hitler Was a Liberal* to a prominent Wall Street broker who had asked for "twenty-five more, making thirty-one in all"; and asked for secret reports on public figures, educators, and such organizations as Friends of Democracy.

Mrs. Jessie Welch Jenkins, anti-Semitic crackpot of Georgia, has corresponded with Kamp, asked his advice in propaganda tactics, passed along gossip and conflicts among the anti-Semites, and also warned Kamp against alleged traitors in the movement.

The *Fiery Cross*, official publication of the K.K.K., during the early forties editorially lauded one of Kamp's pamphlets, *The Fifth Column in the South*.

Let us see how the troublemakers in this network seize upon important issues and exploit them:

During recent years, the United States, with other countries of the world, has been grappling with the problem of genocide. Genocide is the calculated destruction of a racial, ethnic, religious, or national group of people. A treaty declaring genocide to be an international crime was signed by forty-three members of the United Nations, including the United States. In 1951, it had been ratified by sufficient countries to make it operative. The United States has not yet ratified it.

There is room for difference of legal opinion in this issue. Essentially the Genocide Convention declares for the first time that planned extermination of racial and ethnic groups—such as the Turkish massacre of Armenians in World War I and Hitler's extermination drive against Jews, Poles, Russians, and others in World War II—is a crime punishable by the international community. Under the Convention, no longer can a madman who has corrupted a nation excuse mass murder of racial or ethnic groups on the ground that it was simply war.

The Genocide Convention serves notice that in the future those guilty of this crime must bear the responsibility for it. This represents the major argument in its favor.

The major objection to the Convention was reflected in an article by Arthur Krock, chief of the Washington Bureau of the *New York Times*. Writing on June 15, 1950, he described the misgivings held by some people who feel that the Genocide Convention might conflict with American constitutional principles. He reported the opinion of those who are honestly concerned with the possible unconstitutionality of such an agreement, and who have other objections to it.

Thus far, we see the legitimate give-and-take with respect to a socio-political issue.

But then a troublemaker enters the debate and confuses the issue with appeals to religious prejudice. He utilizes the question to implant fear, distrust, and hysteria in the American people. He depicts the Convention as a sinister attempt on the part of aliens to control free Americans. Day after day, the troublemaker hammers home the idea that it is some kind of monstrous conspiracy against the American people. He calls names instead of grappling with issues; he twists facts instead of analyzing them.

Robert H. Williams in his *Williams' Intelligence Summary*, employs the technique in this statement:

Once it [the Genocide Treaty] becomes definitely binding, you or I may then be seized and tried in Jerusalem or Moscow or somewhere in the Punjab—I am not joking—by a jury picked by God-knows-what unseen hand, if we hurt the feelings of a Jew or other “minority.”

Here is not only a complete distortion of the Genocide Convention, and a nightmarish interpretation of how this measure, already approved by a majority of the nations of the world, would operate: but here also is an attempt to invoke fear of strange courts in strange lands, and prejudice toward Jews.

This same approach was used in the troublemakers' attack upon fair-employment-practices legislation. Sincere critics of FEPC do not deny that many Americans find it difficult to obtain employment because of race or religion. They do not deny that discrimination represents an abuse of democracy and needs correction. But they do not attack FEPC by invoking latent prejudices. Rather, they stress the conflict between Federal powers and State rights. They emphasize the natural rights of the employer as against those of the employee. They assert that the best method to correct inequality of employment opportunity is not through legislation, but by education and voluntary co-operation.

The *Christian Science Monitor*, in an editorial on January 27, 1951, reflects this critical attitude:

We can all agree that progress out of discrimination is urgently necessary . . . but . . . even in the Northern states which have adopted FEPC laws there have been only the most gingerly attempts at enforcement. The real reliance is on education and consultation. This method should be extended and tested far more fully before any Federal coercion is attempted.

This is a sane, responsible comment. But Robert Williams prepared a booklet on the subject, entitled *FEPC and the Minority Machine*. He introduces his booklet in his *Williams' Intelligence Summary* of January 1950 with the words: "Working together like cheering squads, the three mightiest revolutionary organizations ever tolerated in a modern nation have deployed their forces for the attack enactment of FEPC. These subversive groups are the Communist Party, the Zionist official body, the American Jewish Congress, and the infinitely more powerful Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith."

Merwin K. Hart, a consistent opponent of legislation designed to insure equality for all American groups, is ever ready to distort the issue by pinning the Communist label upon his oppo-

nents. In arguing against fair-employment-practices legislation in his publication on December 1, 1950, he declared:

There should be a re-examination of the whole idea of FEPC. Seldom has a measure offered in Washington and in several of the States had a more definitely Communistic origin than the effort to compel people to employ certain individuals and not to employ others. It is of the very essence of Marxist dictatorship.

In the previous July he wrote:

Under the propaganda of local minorities, the Congress has wasted an unconscionable amount of time debating an FEPC bill. This bill, if enacted, will impose the will of a minority on the great majority of the American people.

The constant specter of conspiracy and dictatorship is invoked in virtually every comment made by these men on every issue which they seek to damn.

A third issue of current importance to the country is that of modern education. Some persons believe that modern education, with its emphasis on developing the child's personality, overlooks the importance of the three Rs. Their arguments are that much modern education leaves youngsters with little actual grounding in traditional academic subjects. Tangential to this is the question of Federal aid to education. Opponents of Federal aid to education frequently express fears that such aid means too much centralization of government.

For example, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce opposes Federal aid to education because:

1. The Federal Government can't afford it.
2. The "poorer" states in the South have displayed "marked improvement" in ability to pay for their own schools.
3. A growing number of leading educators have voiced alarm that Federal aid to education will eventually lead to federalization of schools.

But the troublemakers do not cite such arguments. Instead Allen Zoll, in his publication *Educational Guardian*, denounces

Federal aid as "dangerous and socialistic legislation." As for modern education, Zoll, through his most recent promotion, the National Council for American Education, has this to say:

It [progressive education] has robbed growing youth of the ability to think independently, it spawns its millions mentally conditioned only for the collectivist state, it robs those it blights of the moral standards by which alone a people may maintain a secure, free, coherent society.

Merwin K. Hart echoes Zoll's attack in describing modern education as "dedicated to the replacement of the American system of private enterprise by some form of statism, which means Socialism or Communism." Hart also echoes Zoll (or vice versa) with respect to Federal aid:

Prominent among left-wing measures now being pushed by left-wingers is Federal aid to education, through which its proponents hope to secure Federal control of education.

Organized labor, as an issue, provides still another touchstone for recognizing the technique of the troublemakers. Senator Robert A. Taft, in a radio address some years ago, declared:

If there is one subject on which every unprejudiced person is agreed, it is that unions must be made responsible for their acts; that collective bargaining cannot continue to be an important factor in our labor relations unless both parties are bound by their contracts.

Senator Taft was speaking for a point of view critical of organized labor, but one which does not use the inflamed arguments of the bigots.

Contrast Taft's remarks with those of the troublemakers.

Upton Close, in a broadcast, January 8, 1950:

How far these groups are willing to go in pressuring is shown by the threat of one, called "Labor's League for Political Education." It threatens to take its nationally-collected funds and smear artists into the home districts of twenty-six named Senators and eighty-one

named Representatives to defeat them in the fall elections, and thus create a Congress which will be entirely the creature of this group. Owning Congress, they will own the nation, and can do what their leaders please with you and me and what *we* own . . .

Joseph Kamp:

These curious, unscrupulous outfits [P.A.C., League for Political Education, Americans for Democratic Action] together with the Reds who dominate them, the cunning nature of their techniques, and the vicious intolerance of their sordid propaganda endanger free elections in the United States and presage the doom of constitutional government.

Merwin K. Hart:

A third tool of the Communist-Socialist group is the extravagant advantages given by statute to what has come to be known as "Labor." These organized minority groups include in the United States the C.I.O., the A.F.L., the United Mine Workers and the Railroad "Brotherhoods" . . .

In one of his *National Economic Council Letters*, Hart prefaces his distortions with a disclaimer: "Few people would deny the right of any group to organize to better their economic condition." Then he adds:

But Karl Marx made this "right" the implement of revolution, and American left-wingers have made it a facile instrument for ruthless men, some of them Communists, and many of them gangsters, to "organize" millions of men and women and subject the rank and file members of labor unions to virtual slavery.

What such contrasting statements—those of the hate cabal, compared to that of Senator Taft, as spokesman for those with legitimate arguments—point up is that responsible leaders discuss the rights and obligations of organized labor, while the others, through bias and distortion, seek to make the American people believe that labor leaders were spawned in Moscow and are plotting to destroy the American system.



About each other, the members of the network speak well. For example, Merwin K. Hart, in the *National Economic Council Letter* of September 1, 1950, speaks highly of Joseph P. Kamp, who had been convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing to supply information regarding his Constitutional Educational League.

"Joe Kamp has been jailed for fighting to maintain the American Republic."

Hart added, to make the point clearer:

The National Economic Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, Rumely, and the Constitutional Educational League . . . are probably the three outstanding organizations in opposition to both Communism and socialism.

Hart extends his blessings to others in a letter to a friend:

It seems to me that organizations which should be supported include . . . Upton Close, *Common Sense* . . .

Kamp, always willing to cooperate, returned the compliment, with interest. Speaking in Connecticut in April 1950, at a meeting sponsored by the Minute Women of the United States, a nationalist organization, Kamp described Gerald L. K. Smith, chief of the rabble-rousers, Elizabeth Dilling, the frenetic anti-Semitic pamphleteer, and Merwin K. Hart in the following terms:

"I have never heard anything against these three people. I don't know that they have done anything subversive. I believe their activity always has been in the best interests of the United States."

(Rumely's Committee for Constitutional Government published a pamphlet, *How We Blundered into Korean War and Tragic Future Consequences*, by Robert B. Dresser, which also defended Kamp in his hour of distress:

. . . Joseph P. Kamp is one of our finest and most patriotic citizens, who has spent years of his life in exposing the shortcomings and

## 5 NETWORK

objectives of the clique that has been ruling this country for seventeen years. As a reward for his efforts, he has been sent to jail.)

Allen Zoll joins the chorus in his *Educational Guardian* of July 15, 1949:

. . . Upton Close, . . . and the National Economic Council are among the outstanding pro-American individuals and organizations that have given a boost to the National Council for American Education's reports.

Gerald Smith praises Merwin K. Hart, who lauds Allen Zoll, who extols Joseph P. Kamp, who acclaims Gerald Smith: and so the circle is completed.

# 6

## CONFUSION FROM THE LEFT

The Communists are major trouble-makers in the field of human relations, particularly in matters dealing with civil rights. In their attempt to transform our society from a capitalistic democracy to a Soviet Communism—and to prove the need for this change—they exploit every issue confronting the American people.

Absolute proof of Communist intellectual dishonesty is that civil rights are not tolerated in the Soviet Union. They are anathema to Communism. When American Communists enter the ranks of those who genuinely support civil rights, they do so with malice aforethought and with deliberate intent to confuse. They use the struggle for human rights to spread Communist propaganda in the name of anti-discrimination and anti-racism. Exercising freedom of speech and using techniques of agitation, they whip up tensions among groups. They exacerbate issues. They magnify racial and religious prejudices in order to cause dissension among the American people. They use the fight for civil rights, in short, as a vehicle to carry them toward their fundamental goal.

The Communists themselves have

given us glimpses of the motivation behind their techniques of infiltration. In May 1951, Eugene Dennis, secretary general of the Party, and one of the eleven American Communist leaders later convicted and jailed "for conspiring knowingly and willfully to advocate the duty and necessity of overthrowing the Government by force and violence," sent a message to the National Committee of the Communist Party.

To win decisive sections of the American people to the Communist program, he declared, there was needed "a more rapid and imaginative reaction to, and utilization of, issues and events that deeply interest, agitate, or move broad masses." His message was a call to infiltrate, on the largest possible scale, every activity on the American scene that would lend itself to Communist purpose.

Let us look at a few examples, each of which came into the news in recent years—of these "issues and events" in which the Communists are interested, and upon which they seize to "interest, agitate, or move broad masses."

Obviously and unhappily, minority groups provide a fertile field for troublemakers on the left. Here are men and women burdened by discrimination and constantly fighting for equal rights. Understandably, they would react sympathetically toward presumably democratic organizations which offer to help them win their constitutional rights. In truth, however, just as the extremely right-wing troublemakers find Negroes and Jews useful scapegoats, so the Communist Party works zealously among Negroes, Jews, and others in order to dramatize its alleged concern for human rights.

The case of Willie McGee is a graphic example of the Communist technique of distorting and exploiting a racial issue to such a degree that justice becomes difficult to obtain, while simultaneously the Party takes advantage of the situation to spread its propaganda.

Willie McGee, a thirty-seven-year-old Negro, was electrocuted on May 8, 1951, in the penitentiary of Laurel, Mississippi, the town in which he allegedly raped a white woman in 1945. The circumstances of the incident are still not clear. The defense contended that when the woman, with whom McGee was allegedly having an affair, learned that her husband had discovered it, she set up a cry of rape. Whatever the facts, in the nearly six years that elapsed from that day in 1945, Willie McGee, until then utterly obscure, was a Communist *cause célèbre*.

Three times the Mississippi courts tried him; three times he was convicted. Twice the convictions were set aside. The Supreme Court refused to review the case. Five times there were stays of execution. By the time the state executioner wrote *finis* to Willie McGee's tragic and confused life, this Mississippi Negro had been closely identified with Communist propaganda; his wife had toured the country widely under Communist auspices; and the Party itself had so manipulated the cause to promote protest parades, mass meetings, and demonstrations throughout the world that millions had all but forgotten the basic question of his guilt or innocence.

In American cities, thousands massed to shout support of Willie McGee *and* to attack American foreign policy. As far away as Soviet China, students held mass meetings, alternately demanding justice for Willie McGee—*and* denouncing "American imperialism"; picket lines were thrown around American embassies and consulates in still other countries. This juxtaposition alone in countries half-a-world apart indicates the success the Communists won in turning the case into an instrument of anti-American, anti-capitalistic propaganda. They had seized upon it, as they had seized upon the Scottsboro Boys case in the late 1930s, for their own purposes.

It is true that Negro citizens are not equal before the law in some southern states. It is true that in Mississippi and other

southern states seldom, if ever, is a white man sentenced to death after conviction for rape. These inequalities are terrible abuses of civil rights that should and must be corrected. But the fact that the Communist juggernaut crushed McGee's chances for freedom in its calculated race toward its own goals proves that the Communists were far less interested in correcting abuses than in furthering Communism.

Under such circumstances, the difficulties faced by genuine civil-rights groups who seek to help are easy to understand.

The case of the Trenton Six has disturbing parallels to that of Willie McGee. In June 1951, the third jury to try six Negro men charged with murder finally found two of them guilty and set four free. The verdict was denounced throughout the country by decent civil-rights groups, but their voices had long since been lost in the clamor and confusion set up by the Communists. The Party had leaped into the Trenton Six case as an "issue and event" likely to agitate broad masses.

What were the facts? Six Negro men had been charged with the murder on January 27, 1948, of a seventy-two-year-old junk dealer in Trenton, New Jersey. Their identification had been extremely doubtful. The six had been picked up more than ten days after the crime by police smarting under the goad of indignant citizens and inflammatory editorials in the newspapers. Five of the men signed confessions, but later all denied their guilt. They accused the police of extorting the confessions by moral and psychological pressure, by drugs and ugly means.

The Civil Rights Congress—a Communist front—took over. They came into Trenton and launched an intensive campaign, complete to leaflets, mass meetings, and press conferences. They disseminated widely their lurid evaluations of the case, charging that capitalist forces were at work in America to railroad the men to the electric chair. The popular *Reynolds News* of London—certainly no Communist publication—printed the story

under a blaring headline: "They Must Die for Being Black." Moscow newspapers had a field day. India and the Philippine Islands became interested—and indignant. This was just what the Communists wanted—to turn colored peoples in colonial lands against the United States.

The Party's recognition of the propaganda values inherent in such cases was frankly expressed in a memorandum sent its members. It read in part:

The Civil Rights Congress deserves our best support in this case . . . It will send circular letters, conduct a tour of relatives of the Trenton Six, run mass meetings. All this should spread the influence of the C.R.C. These actions will assist us in the fight to quash the indictments of the . . . leaders of the Communist Party.<sup>1</sup> Our part in the fight must be to build the Communist Party as we work with progressives in a coalition for democracy.

The prosecution had been in a dubious position, with charges of gross misconduct by the police and extreme doubt as to the evidence. But with the advent of the Communist Party on the scene—and the unfavorable reaction from the New Jersey community—the prosecution found itself hailed as a martyr to a Communist plot. The Trenton Six had already become pawns in a global propaganda struggle which had little to do with their guilt or innocence.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People entered the case, only to find itself competing with the Communists—and in the eyes of the community, suspect because it was defending the same cause espoused by the Communists. Others who entered had similar experiences. Finally, after the Communists had raised large sums of money for defense, they dropped out of the picture. They had achieved their ends. The case had proved profitable both in terms of propaganda and finances needed to spread more propaganda.

<sup>1</sup>This reference was to the eleven Communist leaders who were later found guilty after trial before Federal Judge Harold R. Medina.

When, in June 1951, the third jury found two of the men guilty and set four free, the case of the two was appealed. Recognizing the confusion caused by the Communists, that same month the militantly anti-Communist C.I.O. Industrial Union of New York City set up a Committee on Civil Rights. It cited the Trenton case, and announced that it would call a conference of all groups interested in seeing that civil-rights cases "are fought on the basic issue of American democracy without becoming a sounding board for Communist propaganda."

The year 1951 saw the last of the nine Scottsboro boys reach freedom. The Scottsboro case is the classic instance of ghoulis Communist exploitation of racial tensions. Here was a case in which the Communist Party, through its International Labor Defense, elbowed aside the N.A.A.C.P. and seized upon the probably false charge of rape made against nine Negro boys, exploiting the case for its own ends in a fashion which has been its pattern ever since. From one end of the country to the other, and throughout the world, the Communists held mass meetings, parades, indignation gatherings, using the cause of the nine Negro youths as a platform from which to sell Communism and indict the American way of life. They used it to spark new racial outbreaks, to inspire hostile incidents. They disrupted communities, smeared as "bigots," "racists," and anti-Negro reactionaries, those non-Communists who supported the defendants—but fought the Party.

Walter White, executive secretary of the N.A.A.C.P., graphically described the Communist technique in his autobiography, *A Man Called White* (Viking, 1948). Writing as an eyewitness, he reported:

Public meetings of the N.A.A.C.P. were particularly the target of the Communist campaign. A favorite device was to announce in such a meeting that one of the Scottsboro mothers was present and demanded the right to speak. If permission was granted, a Communist would make a lengthy introduction in expounding the merits of Com-



munism. If permission were denied, at a prearranged signal, Communists in the audience, or their sympathizers, would join in a shout demanding that the mother be heard. There were only five living mothers of the nine defendants, but many more than five "mothers" were produced in various parts of the country at public gatherings. In one instance, a colored woman presented as a Scottsboro mother had lived for more than twenty years in the northern city in which she spoke.

But in truth, with all their activities purportedly in support of Negro rights, the Communists have failed dismally in carrying out their instructions from above to infiltrate among the Negroes and also in getting them into the Party. In July 1949, a Congressional committee could estimate that of the seventy-four thousand Communist members in the United States, only fourteen hundred—less than one quarter of one per cent—were Negroes. Observers believe that this small Negro membership has dropped sharply, especially after the Korean war. The Communists sought to interpret the Korean conflict as one between the white and colored races, instead of a struggle between democracy and Communism. But they failed to sell this idea. Actually, Negro troops were used extensively. President Truman's appointment of a distinguished Negro woman, Mrs. Edith Sampson, to the United States delegation to the United Nations, also helped give the lie to the Communists—particularly when Mrs. Sampson declared that "I would rather be a Negro in America than a citizen of any other land."

As far back as the late 20s, the Communist Party, in its purported unselfish concern for the Negro's welfare, went so far as to campaign for the establishment of a separate Negro republic in the southern part of the United States, which would be made up of areas predominantly Negro in population. Scarcely a Negro could be found who favored this "black belt" fantasy, but the Communists energetically pushed the scheme as proof of their interest in achieving full civil rights for the Negroes.

The fact is that Negroes know that the Communist Party is not interested in Negro problems *per se*; it is interested in carrying out its own aims, with the Negroes as pawns, if possible. In recent years, the truth of this has become more and more evident.

In late 1951, the Party, discredited by the Korean war, and with its major leaders in jail, transferred its national headquarters to New York's Harlem area. The move was vigorously attacked by Councilman Earl Brown, a Negro legislator who had defeated the Negro Communist leader and representative from that area, Benjamin J. Davis, in the 1949 elections. Davis is one of the Communist politburo since imprisoned.

Referring to the C.P. move to Harlem, Brown declared: "This is an affront to the Negro people of Harlem." And he added: "Now in their crisis, the Communists seek to use Harlem as a cloak for their operations that haven't yet gone underground. They're attempting to play on the needs and grievances of the Negro people and identify them with Communist propaganda. It won't work. Harlem has never been sympathetic to Communism, and Harlem is no refuge for Communism now."

Yet in this period, the Communist Party still proclaimed itself the champion of Negro rights—a fiction which, of course, will be increasingly exposed as time goes on.

Equally clear is the story of Communist failure with regard to Jews. Anti-Semitism provides the Party with what appears to be a golden opportunity. Here, too, are abuses in American social practices which can be exploited, with little real attempt or intent to correct them. Indeed, the more prevalent such abuses, and the more capital made of them, the more plausible appears the Communist Party's contention that it alone is the champion of human rights.

An example—and one which highlights the Party's technique of exploiting religious issues for its own purposes, and while

doing so, actually promoting rather than hampering the activities of racists—is the Boston episode in the summer of 1947.

An announcement was made in St. Louis by Gerald L. K. Smith that he would come to Boston to address a rally on Sunday, July 13, at the Old South Meeting Hall. His purpose was clear. If he received sufficient publicity, his cause would be furthered and he could obtain both funds and perhaps converts.

At this juncture the Communist Party stepped in. In a fashion paralleling its strategy in the Trenton, McGee, and Scottsboro cases, it marshalled its forces and began beating the drum to stir up community feeling. A week before Smith's arrival, the International Fur & Leather Workers Union, led by avowed Communists, canvassed members of the clergy, seeking to persuade them to sign a statement for the newspapers protesting Smith's appearance.

The United Office & Professional Workers of America, a union ousted from the C.I.O. for Communist activity, similarly agitated for dramatic action. The International Workers Order, a Stalinist organization, called a meeting to plan a militant protest. Communist Party leaflets suddenly appeared throughout Boston, denouncing the alleged unmilitant attitude of responsible civic groups. Local college campuses were blanketed with throwaways calling upon students to jam the Hall where Smith was to speak. And the Communist Party of Roxbury dispatched a sound-truck throughout the community, urging everyone within hearing to attend the Smith rally and protest against his appearance.

No circus ballyhoo artist could have done a better advance promotion job for Smith than was done by the Party and its sympathizers in the week before Smith's arrival.

When Sunday, July 13, came, all Boston and its suburbs had been alerted to the event. Smith appeared on the platform. Outside the building there was a virtual carnival of noise and marching, shouting pickets carrying banners and placards. In-

side the hall were a handful of thirty-five to forty Smith followers and a crowd of several hundred agitated persons who jeered and booed Smith as he spoke.

Smith, who is no fool, made full use of what had been given him. Indeed, had he paid for all this publicity and advance billing, it could not have served him better. Whenever the booing subsided, Smith strode to the front of the platform and shouted, "Pep it up, pep it up, pep it up!" He did not mind that the booing made it all but impossible to hear what he had to say: he had already addressed his handful of followers that morning and the night before in another local meeting place. Their presence in the hall was little more than window trimming for a huge and dramatic spectacle worth thousands of dollars in publicity for Smith—a huge and dramatic spectacle virtually staged for him by the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations.

The Party, in the name of combating anti-Semitism—as it had elsewhere done in the name of combating anti-Negro prejudice—succeeded only in promoting the very cause it pretended to oppose. Proof that the Party was exploiting Smith's appearance for its own purposes was contained in a leaflet put out by the Communist Party of Massachusetts less than two weeks later. This was entitled *Recruiting Through Struggle*. It showed photographs of the crowds picketing Smith's appearance, and asserted: "Aren't you proud of the spirit of the fight against fascism in the picture of the picket line . . . Tell him or her how THE PARTY fights fascism. And get them into the Party."

Despite such tactics, the Communists have failed in their efforts to infiltrate into the organized Jewish community, precisely as they have failed among Negroes.

But the Communists (and the anti-Semites) have succeeded, to a degree, in confusing the popular mind with regard to Jews and Communism. A case in point is the spy convictions early in 1951 of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. Their death sentence for war-time espionage involving atomic bomb secrets was seized

upon by anti-Semites to bolster their propaganda canard that Judaism and Communism are one. But it was also seized upon by the Communists.

The New York *Daily Worker*, the Party's mouthpiece in this country, attacked the death penalty as the product of anti-Semitism in America. This, said the *Daily Worker* with great indignation, was proof of religious prejudice in this country. Judge Irving Kaufman, the trial judge, and Irving Saypol, the Federal prosecutor, were both Jewish. The *Daily Worker* interpreted this as follows: "The U.S. racists . . . get a Jewish prosecutor and a Jewish judge to do the dirty work." And Judge Kaufman, it added, "deserves the title of 'Honorary Aryan.'"

The *Daily Worker* here was creating a religious issue where none existed. The newspaper's insincerity is pointed up by its failure to become equally excited about the extinction of civil rights in the Soviet Union, whose political philosophy it hails. One cannot find in the *Daily Worker's* columns any criticism of the Soviets' purge of Jewish intellectuals. Neither can one learn from it that Jews in the Soviet Union have been forced from "sensitive" positions in the armed forces, foreign service, and education; nor that no Jewish newspapers are published and no Jewish organizations or institutions permitted to operate in the Soviet Union.

The failure of the Communist troublemakers to infiltrate Jewish groups and to win them over is recognized by Party leaders. This is frankly admitted, in the July 1950 issue of *Political Affairs*, by John Williamson, national labor secretary of the Party and, like Eugene Dennis, one of the convicted eleven.

*Political Affairs* is an American monthly "devoted to the theory and practice of Marxist-Leninism" and one of the authoritative mouthpieces of the American Communist movement.

Williamson charged that the Party had failed in the job of leading American Jewry into the Communists' "struggle against the war-mad adventures of Wall Street and Washington." He

enumerates what he describes as “weaknesses in the Communist Party’s ideological work” and goes on to say: “In our opinion the mobilization of the Jewish masses in the fight for peace is not adequate and the organization and building of a broad united-front movement for peace among the Jewish people and their organizations is completely absent.”

For those interested in the Party’s efforts to organize and utilize Jewish organizations and individuals for its own purposes, Williamson’s article makes interesting reading. He explains:

In developing . . . united-front movements of struggle . . . it is always decisive to activate the rank-and-file masses. While exposing the demagogic policies of the top leaders of such organizations as Americans for Democratic Action and the Liberal Party (in New York) it is necessary to develop forms of joint activity and struggle embracing the rank and file of these organizations. As regards the more progressive groupings within the Zionist fold in America, or for that matter any other mass people’s organization, it is correct for our Party or Left-influenced organizations to try to win them to united-front activities, providing such activities are always based on the well-established Party policy regarding united fronts . . .

We also favor progressive-led Jewish organizations fighting to participate in local Jewish Community Councils on the basis of democratic rights and freedom of action in policy and activities outside the Councils.

Williamson complains:

Our comrades do not possess a grasp of the Party tactic of united labor action among the Jewish workers. Nor is there clarity on the part of everyone, even in these meetings, of the leading role of the workers in the struggle for united action of the progressive sections of the Jewish people on issues of specific concern to them as Jews.

He calls for “greater efforts” to be made “to work among the English-speaking Jews, particularly workers,” and warns the Party members:

The bourgeoisie concentrates special attention on these sections for the purpose of influencing the entire Jewish people with chauvinist nationalism and jingoism and winning their support for imperialistic policies.

What this Party leader says is revealing when contrasted with the October 1946 resolution, "Communist Work Among the American Jewish Masses," passed by the National Groups Commission of the Communist Party, U.S.A. This resolution, which was published in the same periodical, openly blueprinted the Communist attitude toward anti-Semitism. Regardless of how the Party itself purports to fight for the correction of anti-Semitic abuses, the resolution makes clear its fundamental thinking:

. . . anti-Semitism in this country will be completely and permanently uprooted and eventually disappear altogether, only with the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism in the United States.

If there is any further question that the Communist approach toward minority problems is distinctly its own, and not within the democratic framework, the resolution resolved such doubt in unequivocal language:

The Party states that there is a Marxist, a Communist answer to the special needs and problems of the nationality groups.

This resolution also declared that the "winning" of the Jewish War Veterans was a major task. Williamson, writing four years later, however, makes no mention of this major task; apparently the Party has given up the struggle to save the souls of the Jewish veterans. He does demand that every effort be made to "enlist broad support by the American Jewish people for the world peace pledge adopted at Stockholm."

In this hope—as in the hope of winning the Jewish War Veterans—the Party far overreached itself. Seldom has any campaign met so resounding a slap from Jewish groups. On August

17, 1950, shortly after Williamson made his appeal, the Anti-Defamation League and other national Jewish organizations, speaking through the National Community Relations Advisory Council, denounced the Stockholm Appeal as a "despicable divide-and-conquer tactic." The organizations called upon "all who wish to serve the peace of the world and the preservation of freedom to reject, with calm and common sense, the Stockholm Appeal."<sup>2</sup> They added:

It is a well-known Communist technique to make special and divisive appeals to the various religious, nationality, and racial groups in the United States . . . By circulating the "Stockholm Appeal" the Communists are attempting to provoke the American people to violence, threat of violence, mob action, and disruptive disturbances . . . We urge the American people to avoid this trap. American democracy can and must be preserved not by abrogating the cherished principles of civil liberties but by confident reliance upon lawful processes and the appropriate government agencies.

In the end the Communists fail to win converts—even though they succeed to a degree in confusing many with regard to civil-rights issues. Their basic failure augurs well for the rank and file of decent Americans.

The resistance of the minority groups frustrates Party plans. They know what the Communists are up to; they understand the techniques of infiltration, the seizures of control, the throttling of membership organizations. They are aware of subsequent exploitation of such organizations for Party purposes.

How such knowledge, not only on the part of minority groups but on the part of decent civil-rights groups, can cope with Communist attempts to infiltrate, was dramatically exemplified

<sup>2</sup>In addition to the A.D.L., other organizations who signed this denunciation were: American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; B'nai B'rith; Association of Jewish Chaplains of the Armed Forces; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish War Veterans of the United States; National Council of Jewish Women; Union of American Hebrew Congregations.



by the United Committee for Civil Rights of Portland, Oregon, in the autumn of 1950.

The town's progressive, pro-democratic organizations were campaigning for the passage of an important civil-rights ordinance. A central United Committee for Civil Rights was set up. At once the Communists sought to participate. On October 10, 1950, the Oregon State Committee of the Communist Party, with pious protestations of sincere interest, officially applied for affiliation with the United Committee.

The letter of refusal sent by David Robinson,<sup>8</sup> an Executive Board Member of the United Committee, stands as a dignified statement of democracy in the face of Communist deceit.

It read in part:

It is our firm conviction that if there was any sincerity of purpose in your statement favoring adoption of the Civil Rights Ordinance, you would be anxious to withhold the kiss of death impliedly involved in an endorsement by you.

We have every reason to question the good faith of the Russian-inspired and controlled Communist Party of the U.S. in expressing desire to affiliate with our Committee. Our aims and purposes are totally at variance . . . The insignificant membership of the American branch of the Russian Communist Party is convincing evidence that our conception of free political institutions and the democratic structure of our society with all the room for improvement which admittedly exists make the field a sterile one for the growth of Russian-controlled Communism. That undoubtedly is the reason the Communist Party desires the failure, not the success, of the significant social changes which are steadily being achieved . . .

You have no place in the United Committee for Civil Rights. Your program and tactics are to create turmoil, unrest, and confusion. We want none of this. We are taking our case to the citizens of Portland in the American democratic way. We are asking the voters to approve the Civil Rights Ordinance so that human beings will be able to purchase food and shelter without religious or racial discrimination . . . I am hopeful and confident that the voters of Portland

<sup>8</sup>Mr. Robinson is also an assistant national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

## 6 CONFUSION FROM THE LEFT

will approve the Ordinance which was unanimously passed by the City Council. I am equally confident that the rulers of the Kremlin and their American followers will hail the defeat of the measures . . .

By unanimous vote of the Executive Committee of the United Committee for Civil Rights, your application for affiliation has been rejected.

# 7

## BALLOTS FOR BIGOTRY

One of the most dangerous uses of racial and religious prejudice is in election campaigns. The classic example of such appeals to bigotry is the Smith-Hoover presidential race of 1928. In that campaign, the late Alfred E. Smith was the victim of a nation-wide wave of prejudice in which his Catholicism became as important an issue as his political views. Here was character defamation on a religious level, carried out by distortion of Smith's relationship to his church and to his coreligionists here and abroad.

There is no question but that these attacks upon his Catholicism played a part in Smith's defeat. If, however, the country was treated to a coast-to-coast appeal to bigotry which became a national disgrace, the revulsion which set in was a healthy one. Nothing comparable to the anti-Smith campaign, in either scope or virulence, has appeared on the American political scene since.

Similar appeals to prejudice, but on a smaller scale, marked the presidential campaigns of 1940 and 1944, when President Roosevelt, according to anti-Semites, was under the "sinister" influence of "powerful Jewish advisors." Professional ped-

dlers of hate joined with political opportunists to damn the New Deal as a "Jew Deal" and to attribute American entrance into World War II to "Jewish pressure" to save the Jews of Germany. The presidential campaign of 1948 was relatively free from such divisive attacks, although the attempts to make Zionism synonymous with Communism—and thus smear Jewish candidates for office in November of that year—reflected the newer tack taken by troublemakers in the political field.

In 1950–51, because there was no presidential election, no opportunity was provided for country-wide appeals to prejudice against a single candidate. But there were many local, state, and senatorial election campaigns in which bigotry was either raised outright or blended with the smear technique.

In some instances, there were public appeals to anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, or anti-Catholic prejudice. In others, particularly in the South, candidates were denounced as tools of minorities if they supported FEPC, which was attacked as a socialistic and un-American strait-jacket foisted upon the American people by "aliens," the "foreign-born," and minority groups. In still others, no holds were barred: any support by a political aspirant of fair employment practices, anti-segregation measures, or liberal legislation of any kind, was proclaimed as proof of pro-Communist sympathies.

The record of success of such tactics in this period is a mixed one. Several major senatorial candidates went down to defeat, victims of the adroit use of racial and religious prejudice. However, candidates who ran on clearly bigoted platforms generally received short shrift from the voters.

What was done—and how it was done—is worth examination.

On a warm summer day in 1951, thousands of copies of a circular were distributed in the Puerto Rican section in upper New York City. Written in Spanish, on the stationery of the Citizens' Committee for the Election of Enrique Calderon for the Demo-

cratic Leadership of the 14th Assembly District, East, the circular read in part:

Puerto Ricans, read! All the Puerto Ricans are in accord that we need and are entitled to representation in New York. Enrique Calderon, a Puerto Rican, is the candidate for leader. Samuel Kantor, a Jew, is the present leader of the Puerto Ricans. This is a humiliation for every Puerto Rican man and woman to support a Jew who is an enemy of the Puerto Ricans and all Christians . . . Every Puerto Rican voter, registered with the Democratic Party, who desires to save the Puerto Rican dignity and wishes to vote for the Puerto Rican candidate, fill out the enclosed card and mail it as soon as possible . . .

Here was the most primitive kind of appeal to racial prejudice, coupled with an equally blatant appeal to racial solidarity in a community which has not yet had the opportunity to become fully assimilated in New York. If Calderon, who was so bold as to sign the letter himself, counted upon exploiting this situation, he was soon proved wrong. The two most important Spanish-language newspapers in New York immediately denounced the letter and those sponsoring it in no uncertain terms.

New York's *La Prensa*, in an editorial entitled "Let's Have No Racial or Religious Prejudice in Our Community," declared:

The circular appeals in the most lamentable and loathesome manner to the prejudice of a section of the Spanish community, attempting to predispose it against the official candidate of the party because he is a member of a specific race and religion, as though that had anything to do with his capacities as a citizen for the post to be voted on . . . There is no need to say that it does not represent—far from it—the feeling of the Spanish-speaking community. This community has traditionally lived in perfect harmony with other minority ethnic groups and one of its most frequently remarked characteristics has been precisely its opposition to racial and religious prejudice. It will not let itself be influenced by this call to one of the foulest forms of intolerance.

*El Diario de Nueva York* was no less indignant, if more measured, in tone:

To attack a candidate for being Jewish is just as unjust, as arbitrary, as anti-democratic, as attacking a candidate for being Puerto Rican . . . To call up against a candidate prejudices grounded in [religion, race, color, or national origin,] or to seek votes by stirring up ancestral animosity and hatreds, is to choose the wrong path. Democracy condemns prejudice. Democracy calls for the selection of the most suitable for public office, not by rousing hatreds, nor sharpening resentments, but rather by weighing worth, appreciating merits, analyzing attitudes, and examining records of service.

In September 1951, Calderon was roundly defeated. Kantor was elected. Bigotry here had not paid off in ballots.

A less vulgar anti-Semitic attack—cloaked in what purported to be a sincere religious conviction—was made in Knoxville, Tennessee, where Mrs. Harry (Amelia Corkland) Strauss was defeated as candidate for Justice of the Knox County Domestic Relations Court.

Mrs. Strauss is a prominent local attorney, who has long been active in civic affairs. Her opponent was the Republican incumbent, Judge H. B. Webster. The campaign began quietly enough. There was no question about her abilities or her character. No record of subversive history could be found. But in July 1950, a month before the election, a whispering campaign got under way against her, based on the fact that she was Jewish.

This was brought into the open by the Knoxville *News-Sentinel*, which supported her candidacy. The newspaper vigorously condemned the attacks upon her: “. . . the fact is mentioned that Mrs. Strauss is Jewish. As if that made any difference! Since when did this democracy repeal religious freedom?”

A few weeks later the newspaper published a letter from a well-known Presbyterian minister, who complimented Mrs. Strauss for her courage in “risking herself as a target for the

insinuated and implied smears which are so characteristic of what we call politics today." Promptly Judge Webster's supporters accused the *News-Sentinel* of injecting racial prejudice into the campaign.

The *News-Sentinel* retorted:

. . . Campaign spokesmen [for Judge Webster] are now saying that the *News-Sentinel* is responsible for raising the religious issue. The spokesmen are being cleverly pious about the whole thing—in fact, just too clever. They bring the subject up for the sole purpose of reminding the crowds that Mrs. Strauss is Jewish.

At this point the campaign became even more bitter. Ray Jenkins, a local attorney and Republican leader, told an audience at the Knox County Young Republican Club that a "devil's crusade" against Christian principles had been organized in an effort to defeat Judge Webster.

The *News-Sentinel* quoted him as saying:

"It is a campaign of fanatics—a select group—that will stop at nothing and yet they have the nerve to call it a crusade. They conducted the same crusade against Christ and they carry on down into the present day and those who believe in the things that Christ stood for will not tolerate it."

This same note was struck in a slightly different key a few days later. A campaign letter signed by a C. "Jack" Richards stated that a belief in the New Testament was an essential qualification for anyone who would be a Domestic Relations Judge.

Richards began with a dubious disclaimer:

No one, including myself, would deny Mrs. Strauss or any other individual the right to believe and worship God as they please . . . Personally, I think the question of religious qualifications [of a candidate] is just as important as any other.

Then he added:

Perhaps one hundred per cent of the children who will come before this court in the future and their parents will be people who believe

in the doctrines of the New Testament . . . I do not believe any candidate, whether he be Jew, Gentile, Black, or White, is qualified to hold this job and preside over the destinies of my children and yours unless they believe in the doctrines of the New Testament.

The anti-Semitic appeals continued up to the very day of the elections, August 3, when local campaign workers handed out cards urging passers-by to "Vote for a Christian."

Although Mrs. Strauss carried the city of Knoxville, she lost the election by a few more than one thousand votes out of the more than thirty-five thousand that were cast. The narrow margin of her defeat suggested that here was an instance in which anti-Semitism may have been the decisive factor.

Elsewhere in the South, one of the most dramatic—and scurrilous—campaigns based upon bigotry was that which brought about the defeat in North Carolina of former Senator Frank Graham, Democrat. Here was an example of the unscrupulous use of three standard weapons in the arsenal of bigotry: anti-Negro sentiment; anti-Semitism; and distortion of FEPC as a Communist-inspired plot against the welfare of the United States.

For more than three decades Dr. Graham has been an outstanding leader of southern liberalism. A distinguished educator, a man of broad humanity known affectionately throughout the state as "Dr. Frank," he was for nearly twenty years the president of the University of North Carolina. His state and his country have frequently chosen him for public service. In 1951 Dr. Graham was appointed by President Truman to be United Nations mediator in Pakistan.

In March 1949, upon the death of Senator J. Melville Broughton, Governor W. Kerr Scott of North Carolina prevailed upon Dr. Graham to resign his university post and take Broughton's seat until the next election. In the senatorial primaries in the spring of 1950, Dr. Graham, seeking to win the four years re-



maining of Broughton's term, found himself in a three-cornered contest. His chief opponent was Willis Smith, a wealthy Raleigh corporation lawyer and one-time president of the American Bar Association.

The attack of the Smith supporters upon Dr. Graham was characterized by the Raleigh *News & Observer* as "the worst campaign of vilification ever seen in North Carolina politics in this century." Smith's campaign, declared the newspaper, was "based upon an effort to destroy the character of Frank Graham" in order that Smith "might walk over his dead body into the United States Senate." And it added scathingly: "No man who seeks the senatorship should ever let himself even seem a stooge for the sewer."

What were these tactics?

Smith charged that Graham was treasonable to the South because as a member of the President's Committee on Civil Rights he did not oppose its endorsement of FEPC. Smith's supporters brought in the convenient charge that Graham was either a Communist or fellow traveler, and cited as proof that he had lent his name to organizations which later appeared in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Actually, Graham was and is a liberal Democrat. He opposed compulsory FEPC, but supported legislation that would gradually, through voluntary co-operation on local, state, and national levels, bring about equality of work opportunity for members of minority groups. As to the Communist issue, Graham made it abundantly clear that he had never knowingly belonged to any Communist-controlled organizations.

These facts were ignored in the attack made by the Smith followers. While the Smith supporters were hammering home on the FEPC issue, there were scores of rallies, radio speeches, hundreds of blaring newspaper advertisements, and thousands of handbills attacking Graham's "socialistic views" and misinterpreting his stand on current issues of the day.

From FEPC it was a short step to the Negro issue. In an obvious attempt to invoke anti-Negro prejudice, four days before the primaries were held, thousands of penny postcards were mailed to the homes of white voters in Raleigh from a New York City address. Signed by "W. Wite, executive secretary, National Society for the Advancement of Colored People," the cards described in adulatory terms what "Dr. Frank" had done for the Negroes.

The signature and organization name could only have been intended to suggest that these cards had been sent by Walter F. White, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The address on the faked cards was 30 West 40th St., New York City. The address of the N.A.A.C.P. is 20 West 40th St., New York City.

At the same time North Carolina's white voters were treated to hundreds of reproductions of a photograph taken seventy-four years ago—that of the South Carolina Legislature of 1874, which had a predominance of Negro members. This was the sort of a legislature, Graham's opponents declared, that "Dr. Frank" wanted to see in North Carolina—and presumably would work for if elected.

Not content with what had been done so far, Smith supporters turned to anti-Jewish prejudice. If there was any substratum of anti-Semitism in North Carolina, they were evidently not adverse to mining it. The *Raleigh News & Observer*, North Carolina's outstanding newspaper, supported Dr. Graham's candidacy, as did the majority of the state's newspapers. Consequently, among the scurrilous anti-Graham handbills tossed about, there were some that featured a cartoon—which might have been lifted directly from the infamous Nazi hate sheet, *Der Stürmer*—caricaturing the editor of the *News & Observer* so as to make him appear a Jew. The *News & Observer* observed:

This [cartoon] did not hurt the editor: it was designed to make not only him but the Jews seem evil. He does resent the effort to bring anti-Semitism into this campaign where it has no place except as the natural consort of hate campaigns everywhere.

Smith, a handsome, self-possessed, and much younger man than Dr. Graham, denied responsibility for this campaign conducted by some of his supporters on a K.K.K. level of race hatred, lies, and insinuations. But in his own speeches, innuendoes were not lacking. Doggedly he declared over and over again that *he* never belonged to, or would ever belong to, subversive organizations. *His* platform was pro-American. And while relentlessly attacking Graham for an FEPC stand which Graham time and again pointed out was not his stand, Smith took pains to note that Graham was on the committee that wrote the FEPC bill "along with Gittelsohn, Shishkin, Haas, and others. It is difficult to believe that Smith's selection of three Jewish-sounding names from the fifteen names on the committee was purely accidental. (Haas is the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, Bishop of Grand Rapids, Michigan.)

In the end, Smith won and Graham was defeated. The victory was a surprise for Smith's backers, for in the beginning they like others believed that they were fighting a losing battle. Here was another instance where the appeal to bigotry may have been the decisive factor in the election.

In the Republican primary race for the Senate in New Hampshire, a note of anti-Semitism comparable to that in North Carolina was reported early in the campaign by William Loeb. Here, too, neither contestant—the incumbent, Senator Charles W. R. Tobey, and his opponent, Wesley Powell—was Jewish. Powell, however, was backed by a former New Yorker, William Loeb, publisher of the *Manchester Morning Union*, who charged that a rumor was spread that he, Loeb, was Jewish and that "New

York Jews" were attempting to force their way into New Hampshire politics.

On September 16, Powell lost the primary to Senator Tobey by the narrow margin of 37,893 to 39,203. A few weeks later, Loeb printed a letter to the *Morning Union* which purportedly came from a Sidney Goldberg of North East Harbor, Maine. This bitterly attacked Loeb and the *Morning Union* and demanded: "Why you New York kikes don't mind your own business?" A thorough investigation was made in North East Harbor but no "Sidney Goldberg" could be found. The only conclusion to be drawn was that the letter was faked, and was intended to confirm the rumor that Loeb was Jewish and that New York Jews had interfered in the New Hampshire political scene.

On October 18, Loeb met this issue by printing a signed front-page editorial entitled "Intolerance Is Not in the New Hampshire Tradition." He accompanied this by a facsimile of his baptismal certificate proving that he was a lifelong Protestant. In his editorial he charged:

Senator Tobey went around the state denouncing the publisher of this newspaper, who, after all, was not a candidate for any office, as a "foreigner," as an "outcast," and as a "New Yorker." Senator Tobey did everything but come right out and call this publisher a Jew . . . This publisher's baptismal certificate . . . is reproduced and this editorial written only because the Tobey attack is an attack upon a religious faith . . .

He added that if he were a Jew, he "would be proud of it," and paid tribute to "the Jews of America who have done much more than their share in building this great land of ours."

Needless to say, Senator Tobey clearly repudiated any prejudicial intent.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Senator Tobey has stated that neither he nor anyone directly associated with him in the re-election campaign was responsible for the "Goldberg letter." Tobey's record is one of undeviating support of civil rights and oppressed minorities. The New Hampshire senator contended that he attacked Loeb only because the latter was "neither a citizen nor a voter" in New Hampshire but "a flagrantly offensive and partisan carpetbagger."

Anti-Catholicism was not absent in this period. It was used in Ohio to help defeat Joseph Ferguson, the Democratic opponent of Senator Robert A. Taft, although Taft clearly repudiated it. First inklings of this appeal to anti-Catholic sentiment in a strongly Protestant state came on October 3, when a Lutheran minister in southwestern Ohio received a letter from the Reverend F. R. Stoneburner, head of the Lutheran Intermission at Dayton, Ohio. The letter, addressed to "Dear Brethren," read in part:

Please accept this letter merely as a matter of information. It should be known that Mr. Joseph Ferguson, who is running against Senator Robert A. Taft, is Roman-Catholic.

Knowing the efforts of the Roman Church to get an official representative to the Vatican, and its efforts to get public aid for parochial schools, I thought it equitable to pass this information on to you for what it is worth.

At once a storm of protest was aroused. Senator Taft, campaigning in Dayton, disavowed the letter completely. "It is contrary to all principles of our campaign," he asserted. "Reverend Mr. Stoneburner has no connection with us and obviously has no connection with any Taft committee at all."

Mr. Stoneburner told a reporter for the Akron, Ohio, *Beacon Journal* that he had written the letter as a "personal communication" to certain Lutheran ministers who had asked him for the information it contained, and "it was never intended to be circulated widely." He did admit, however, that he had given permission to someone, whom he did not identify, to reproduce the letter, but insisted he never expected it to be used as it had.

Undoubtedly, the sentiment of most Ohioans was reflected in the comment made by the Scripps-Howard columnist, Cal Lyon, writing in the Columbus, Ohio, *Citizen*, published in the state's capital:

In this year of 1950 to make a man's church affiliation a determining factor in voting for or against him . . . is to revive and foster the

terrible hatreds that tore Europe asunder for centuries and have resulted in the fall of many a government. Such things should have no place in our Ohio election.

No election year—whether the campaigns be local, state, or national—is complete, it appears, without the divisive activities of Gerald L. K. Smith. In the political field this veteran of the hate axis works under the aegis of his Christian Nationalist Party and its various affiliated groups. Although the Christian Nationalists found themselves in difficult straits in most parts of the country, they managed in 1950 to win the legal right in Missouri to a place on the ballot. They lost no time in exploiting their new respectability.

Six Christian Nationalist candidates qualified for office in Missouri. Their campaigns, as might be expected, made use of every technique of bigotry. Two of their stalwarts—John W. Hamilton, the St. Louis white-supremacist, and Don Lohbeck, editor of Gerald Smith's *The Cross and the Flag*—ran respectively for the United States Senate and House of Representatives. Opal M. Tanner, for years Smith's personal secretary, campaigned for state auditor. Edward Abshier and Joe (Morello) Intagliata were candidates for Congress. Alva Jernigan sought election as collector of revenue.

The Christian Nationalists, able to proclaim themselves a bona fide legal party in Missouri, took advantage of the fact. Opposing candidates used the radio in their campaigns. The Christian Nationalists, in turn, promptly took advantage of the Federal Communications Commission rule which requires radio stations to afford equal facilities for all qualified candidates. Consequently, the voters of Missouri were treated to a campaign of lies, distortion, and outright appeals to prejudice such as had rarely been heard on the air.

In its initial broadcasts the Nationalists' chief target was the Negro, particularly since one of the Republican candidates for Congress from Missouri was Sidney Redmond, a Negro attorney.

But in subsequent radio addresses anti-Semitism crept in under the guise of legitimate campaign speeches.

John W. Hamilton, in a broadcast on September 21, faithfully followed the Smith line. He outlined the platform of the Christian Nationalists, and stressed that one of its basic planks was "the preservation of White Christian America." He portrayed the Nationalists as the implacable foe of Communism, "the enemy of Christianity . . . from its conception in the mind of the Jew Karl Marx."

He told his listeners that his was the only party dedicated to the protection of "racial integrity from the horrible fate of mongrelization" and added: "We will not allow our Christian faith to be attacked by Jewish Zionists for political purposes."

Other Smith candidates took the same line. Citizens of Missouri and surrounding states who turned on their radios would hear warnings that "Communist fellow travelers" are seeking to "replace our Christian culture with the regimentation of Jew worship." On another occasion they were told: "Wherever the Red Army of Communism has come into control and placed a Communist dictator on the throne of power, it has been a Jew who held the power," or, "Powerful Jewish Zionists" are dictating "the foreign policy of the United States . . . to create an anti-American Jewish terror-state in the vital Middle East."

This whipping up of racial and religious antagonism won little for the Smith candidates. Smith himself, in a last-minute effort to draw support for his Missouri political aspirants, came to St. Louis on October 3, and addressed a "campaign rally" at the St. Louis House. He told his listeners: "Thousands of people have been enlightened by these broadcasts."

It was all of no avail. On November 7, the people of Missouri completely repudiated the Christian Nationalist Party candidates. All were defeated, receiving little more than token votes.

Gerald Smith was also active in election campaigns outside Missouri. He headed a group of professional anti-Semites who

ran a vitriolic campaign in Utah against Senator Elbert D. Thomas, who was seeking election to a fourth term. Here the anti-Semitic theme was thinly veiled behind Smith's favorite synonyms for Jew—"alien" and "Red."

First indications that professional bigots were on the scene supporting Thomas's Republican opponent, Wallace F. Bennett (who personally was never linked to them), came when the elderly Miss Marilyn R. Allen, the anti-Semitic pamphleteer from Salt Lake City, distributed a brochure called *Challenge to the Republicans in 1950*, and subtitled *Let's "Can" Senator Thomas*. This described Thomas as a Red who was plotting the downfall of "this Christian Republic," and working for "a species of alien internationalism." Ten thousand copies of this brochure were printed, some of which found their way into Salt Lake City Republican Party headquarters.

Republican campaign officials denied that they were in any way involved in the Allen booklet, but some persons reported that they received it together with other campaign literature distributed by the Republican Party headquarters.

A month before the November elections, a new anti-Thomas pamphlet appeared, this bearing the joint imprint of Gerald Smith's American Anti-Communist League and its local affiliate, the Utah Anti-Communist League. The latter was a Smith front maintained by Marilyn Allen.

The campaign of bigotry against Thomas broke into the open when Thomas himself, speaking before a C.I.O.-A.F.L. banquet in Provo on October 17, charged that Utah's Republican Governor, J. Bracken Lee, had secretly met with Gerald Smith five days before. At the same time, Frank Edwards, Mutual Network news commentator, went on the air to attack "the vicious anti-Thomas pamphlets being handed out by Gerald Smith's outfit:

"These pamphlets were shipped into Utah by an employee of a fellow named Wesley Swift of Los Angeles. This Swift is an admitted



member of the Ku Klux Klan . . . and is a partner of Gerald L. K. Smith. Like Smith, Mr. Swift is violently anti-Semitic and bitterly anti-Catholic, and at this very moment as I speak to you from the studios of KALL, Mr. Swift, the Ku-Kluxer and hate-monger, is right here in Salt Lake City delivering another of his diatribes against Senator Thomas."

Following Edwards's exposé, Democratic Chairman Parnell Black likewise took to the air and bitterly assailed the campaign of "character assassination" conducted against Thomas. Referring to the charge that Governor Lee had met with Gerald Smith, Black asserted:

"Our proof in that regard consists of a statement to that effect made by Marilyn Allen in the presence of several witnesses; and further this same so-called Reverend Wesley Swift made a speech in Los Angeles following his departure from the state of Utah, wherein he stated and boasted that he and Gerald L. K. Smith spent two hours with Governor Lee when they were in this city shortly before the middle of last month."

Swift's speech, to which Black referred, was made on September 15 at a meeting of Swift's Anglo-Saxon Christian Congregation. There Swift said in part:

"While I was there—Salt Lake City—I received a phone call from a state official stating that the Governor of Utah wanted to see me. I went to his office and spoke to him for two hours. The Governor told me he did not fear nor care for the people who opposed me [Swift] meaning the Jew-Commies and Zionist Comrades."<sup>2</sup>

It was not Swift alone who boasted of his part in the Utah campaign. Gerald Smith also bragged of his activities in connection with it. In one of his "confidential" newsletters he reported to his followers:

We were especially active in Utah where Elbert D. Thomas, erstwhile friend of Paul Robeson (the Negro Red), Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, was defeated. He asserted, "It should be noted that Wesley Swift's reputation for veracity leaves something to be desired. Nor should his interpretation of Governor Lee's statement be accepted at face value.

admitted, and told the voters of Utah that the campaign literature which I wrote was that which was being used against him. Similar victories have been won all over America . . .

In view of the fact that Smith's candidates in Missouri were roundly defeated, Smith was guilty of his usual exaggeration.

Bigotry played a part in Colorado, where Representative John E. Carroll lost the race for the Senate to the Republican incumbent, Eugene D. Milliken. A few days before the election, an irresponsibly written pamphlet entitled *How Red Is John Carroll?* appeared under the imprint of the Colorado Anti-Communist League. This organization is headed by Kenneth Goff, who for years has been identified with Gerald Smith.

Goff outlined Carroll's alleged "Red" record; charged that the Democratic candidate had the Kremlin's "stamp of approval"; and urged Colorado voters to "strike a blow to socialism, the welfare state, and Communism" by defeating Carroll in the November elections.

State Senator Lawrence Henry, chairman of the Democratic Central Committee in Colorado, charged that Goff's pamphlet had been widely distributed at Republican rallies, and noted that the attack against Carroll markedly resembled that against Thomas in Utah. Henry asserted:

"These pamphlets are of the character of the Gerald L. K. Smith 'Hate campaign.' They are being spread under the name, guise and direction of Kenneth Goff . . . The Republican leaders of Colorado cannot be unaware that this propaganda is being employed and, therefore, must assume some responsibility for its sponsorship and distribution."

Republican Central Committee Chairman William Lloyd repudiated the Goff leaflet. He declared that the Republicans "had nothing to do" with its issuance or distribution.

In Georgia, the gubernatorial race between Governor Herman Talmadge and former Governor M. E. Thompson revolved

around racial issues. Here, as is true throughout the South, community mores still generally condone the concept of white supremacy, and appeals to racism are still considered "respectable." Talmadge ran on a strict white-supremacy platform. He charged that Thompson was supported by that "FEPC, anti-segregation crowd."

In May, when campaign oratory was at its height, Klanism became a leading issue. Thompson pledged his support to a proposed anti-mask law and blamed recent outbreaks of lawlessness on "allies of the Talmadge machine who specialize in violence and use of fear as their weapon." Talmadge took the offensive and labeled Thompson "a friend of the Negroes, a friend of civil rights, and a friend of FEPC." Thompson, on the defensive, then tried to make clear to Georgia voters that he too believed in white supremacy, segregation, and southern mores.

Talmadge defeated Thompson. Commenting on the victory of "old Gene's son," the *New York Times* noted editorially:

The premium [in this campaign] was on the inflammatory . . . Talmadge laid it on thick, ranting about racial intermingling, Supreme Court, FEPC, and the rising tide of Negro votes . . . A demagogue needs only to shout, the louder the better . . . Talmadge had only to direct his special brand of prejudice to the back country. It mattered little that his words were largely meaningless.

In these elections there were also candidates whose campaign records reveal no appeals to racial or religious prejudice, but who—once in office—have not hesitated to indulge openly in statements prejudicial to minority groups.

In Mississippi, the Honorable John Rankin, who won his sixteenth consecutive term in the House of Representatives, has an incredibly long record of bigotry. He can be counted upon to make the most vicious and vulgar attacks on racial and religious minorities from his privileged platform on the House floor. Besides maligning specific Jews on the floor of Congress, Rankin has accused a "certain racial minority" of "attempting

to destroy Christianity throughout the world." On another occasion he charged this same "racial minority" with introducing Communism to Europe and the United States:

"Atheistic Communism is largely composed of a racial minority that has swarmed into Europe through the Urals in the last one hundred or two hundred years and has now swarmed into this country and constitutes three fourths of the membership of the Communist party in America . . . They have been for nineteen hundred years trying to destroy Christianity and everything that is based on Christian principles. They are now trying to undermine and destroy America."

Rankin is one of those who has consistently attacked the Anti-Defamation League. On June 12, 1950, he charged in the House that the A.D.L. was "attempting to force its anti-segregation program onto the white people in every section of the country."

In Texas, Ed Gossett was re-elected to Congress (later resigning to take a better-paying position in private industry). Gossett has a long history of hostility toward Jewish D.P.s and was involved in the Anna Rosenberg case. He has been a steady favorite of professional anti-Semites throughout the country, and his vituperative remarks have been consistently quoted by such persons as Elizabeth Dilling, Upton Close, C. Leon de Aryan, and Gerald Smith.

In Michigan Clare E. Hoffman won another two-year term in office as Republican Representative from the Fourth Michigan Congressional District. A colleague and admirer of Rankin, Hoffman has found it necessary several times in his career to disclaim publicly that he is anti-Semitic. Hoffman also is a champion of Joseph P. Kamp, whose scurrilous writing he has inserted into the *Congressional Record*.

In Nevada, Patrick A. (Pat) McCarran won his fourth term as Democratic Senator. Although McCarran's public statements regarding minorities are couched in cautious circumlocutions, many of his pronouncements and activities in connection with the Displaced Persons Act have demonstrated his essential hos-

tility toward Jews. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, he has become the symbolic leader of those bigoted groups and individuals who have consistently charged that most immigrants are Jews, and therefore undesirable.

In a statement entitled "Displaced Persons: Fact versus Fiction," which he read into the *Congressional Record* of January 6, 1950, McCarran asserted that there was no need for liberalization of the Displaced Persons Act, and warned that:

" . . . the floodgates of this nation are being pried open for the entrance of millions of aliens, from the turbulent populations of the entire world, who are seeking admission into the United States under the guise of displaced persons. This movement is being facilitated by certain pressure groups in this country which, over the years, have had as their ultimate objective the destruction of our immigration barriers."

Asserting that "it is reliably estimated that approximately four fifths . . . of the displaced persons who were admitted into the United States . . . were of Jewish faith," McCarran charged that "on the basis of my investigation [we are admitting] persons who will not become good citizens and who will become ready recruits in subversive organizations [which seek] to tear down the democracy of the United States . . ."<sup>8</sup>

A few days after McCarran delivered this speech in the Senate, it was revealed that many of his "facts" regarding displaced persons had been given him by John W. Cutler, an employee of the Displaced Persons Commission in Germany. In a

<sup>8</sup>The Displaced Persons Act expired in December 1951. The record reveals that under the Act, 46 per cent of the D.P.s admitted to the United States were Catholic, 34 per cent were Protestant or Greek Orthodox, 19 per cent were Jewish, and 1 per cent "other and unknown." The Act specifically barred all subversives from entry (as do the nation's immigration laws). Every D.P. applicant was carefully screened by U.S. Army Counter-Intelligence before being admitted to the United States. The Army findings were subjected to scrutiny not only by the D.P. Commission, but also by the U.S. State Department and the Justice Department's Immigration Service. As a result, visas were refused to approximately eight thousand applicants. Aliens found to be subversive were subject to deportation; only three D.P.s had to be deported.

statement issued by the Commission, Cutler was characterized as one who had "earned a fairly general reputation among his own colleagues in Europe of being a bitterly bigoted young man with a strong personal bias against persons of a particular faith."

On March 22, 1950, McCarran publicly denied that he was an anti-Semite. Defending his stand on D.P. legislation in a speech before San Francisco's Commonwealth Club, he claimed that the law he favored was not discriminatory toward the Jews. As evidence of his own tolerance, he declared: "I have no more close friend than Bernard Baruch along with thousands of fine Jews."

However, in the same address, he offered statistics to "prove" that a disproportionate number of D.P.s admitted into this country in the war years had been Jewish, and he added:

"Our greatest enemy, Communism, has used D.P.s to strengthen its program in this country . . . Those in whose veins flows Western blood are resolved that there be greater screening of D.P.s . . . to disclose if they are Communists."

In recent years, few political candidates have run openly on platforms which appealed to bigotry or slandered minority groups. Except in the South, where Negro-baiting still produces political dividends, the blatant bigot has nearly always been defeated. In the main, bigotry has been losing politics in America, and will continue to be losing politics so long as Americans remain true to their heritage of freedom and equality for all our citizens.

But, as we have seen, too many political candidates are prepared to accept covert support from professional bigots. Also, where the stakes of political victory are high, the temptation to employ irresponsible smears and vicious propaganda is great. The dignity and honor of American life cannot permit a recurrence of another 1928 campaign against Alfred E. Smith in the

**nation or in the states. The use of the irresponsible political smear must end. Those who play upon the unfounded fears or suspicion of minority groups are guilty of offenses more serious than those condemned in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. Americans of good will must increase their vigilance to see that those politicians who employ such corrupt election practices are relegated to political oblivion.**





# 8

## BARBED WIRE

In August 1950, Sumner L. Kaplan, a young World War II veteran who had survived the death march on Bataan and somehow had managed to live through nearly four nightmarish years as a prisoner of the Japanese, learned something new about the country for which he had almost given his life.

His nerves overwrought, his health poor, he had been advised to live in a small, quiet community and avoid any high-pressure work. He searched and finally found a home he could afford in a new housing development which seemed ideally suited to his needs. This was in Needham, Massachusetts, half an hour's drive from Boston, where his parents lived.

Kaplan called upon the contractor in charge of the development, but when he described the house he wanted to buy, the latter hemmed and hawed.

"May I make a suggestion," he said. "Why don't you look somewhere else? I can find some other place for you—but not there."

"But it's just what I want," protested Kaplan, still unsuspecting. "What's wrong with Needham?"

The other shook his head. "I'm sorry, Mr. Kaplan, but I can't sell

that to you. Now, don't get me wrong . . . Some of my best friends are Jews. But I've sold all the other houses there to veterans with the understanding that I wouldn't sell to Jews." He paused, and brightened. "But there are lots of other places where they allow Jews . . . Why don't you start looking around again?"

Kaplan spoke bitterly of the incident. "The Japs didn't care whether I was Jewish or not. When they made life hell for us, they didn't ask our religion—any of us. All they cared about me and my buddies was that we were Americans—not whether we were Catholics, Protestants, or Jews.

"But here, in my own United States, they do care. And this is how they show it."

In recent years it would not be difficult to find other Sumner Kaplans—or those belonging to different minority groups—who learned through shattering personal experience that their own country was in many parts forbidden to them—divided into areas in which others might live, but not they; communities in which others might build their homes and rear their children, but from which they were excluded.

In New York City, for example—a vast center whose cosmopolitan population tends to make it less marked by racial and religious prejudice than many other cities—it was estimated that at least one in every fifteen persons was not free to choose where he would live.

The evil of housing segregation must not be underestimated. For housing itself, in the last analysis, really determines whether the community—the very basis of our American society—shall be democratic or undemocratic. It determines whether the patterns, the folkways of that community, are to be democratic or undemocratic. A system of restricted housing which rates Americans according to a hierarchy of alleged racial or religious superiority, and by that measure separates one group from another, is a denial of everything for which our free society stands.

It makes hypocrisy of our preachments of equal opportunity. The attempt to segregate citizens, to confine thousands of Americans behind the invisible barbed wire of ghettos, Harlems, "hunkey-towns," and little Italys has dangerous and far-ranging sociological, psychological, and economic repercussions. If it creates a sense of exclusiveness in one group, it creates resentments and tensions in others. Wherever it exists, it is accompanied by a Pandora's box of evils: overcrowding and economic exploitation; inflated real estate values and deterioration of neighborhoods; inadequacy of such services as street maintenance and rubbish collection, and of fire and police protection and educational facilities—with a consequent rise in juvenile delinquency and crime; erroneous conceptions of the morals and mores of the segregated groups; ever increasing fear and hatred toward one's fellow Americans; and, ultimately, racial strife and violence.

The kind of "understanding" between the developer of the Needham housing project and those who purchased homes there represents only one of the many restrictive practices used to deny Americans the right to choose shelter in their own country. These practices take ingenious forms. Until recently the most popular was the restrictive covenant—a written agreement between landlords not to rent or sell to members of certain minority groups.

This covenant was actually a perversion of a type of legal agreement which originally came into use as a means of preventing residential land from being made useless—to prevent others from establishing tanneries, glue factories, steel mills, gambling houses, and other industrial or commercial enterprises which would have had an adverse effect on neighboring residential sections. When proponents of racial or religious segregation cast about for some legal instrument to use, they found that these restrictive covenants could be twisted to their purposes. They simply directed them not against the unsocial

use of the land, but against its occupancy by members of certain identifiable groups.

The courts, which had enforced the original restrictive covenants for many decades, apparently failed to notice the difference between them and the new racial-religious covenants, and generally ordered their enforcement when cases were brought to law. As a result, these restrictive pacts have affected vast portions of urban residential land in the United States for the last few decades.

In May 1949, however, the United States Supreme Court in a historic decision ruled that such covenants could not be enforced in the courts because of the "equal protection" guarantee to all persons by the Fourteenth Amendment. This led the segregationists to turn to other devices to gain the same ends, and these ranged from attempts to inflame racial tensions to outright destruction of property.

A case in point is that of Mr. and Mrs. Preston Wilson, a pleasantly mannered couple who in 1950 purchased an attractive home in Leimert Park, a residential section of Los Angeles. The house had been sold to them, after it had been on the market for a long time.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilson were Americans and were unquestionably decent, solid, and well-respected citizens. But their skin was not white. Because of this, a number of events occurred. Their white neighbors promptly founded Neighborly Endeavor, Inc., which belied its name by seeking ways and means to sue the original owner for "damages" because he had sold his house to the Wilsons. In the course of the agitation, Mrs. Wilson found a gaily wrapped gift on her doorstep one morning. When she removed the wrappings, she found a candy box; and inside this, she found a dead rat.

Presently it was learned that another member of the community had agreed to sell his home to a Negro family. When he returned from a week-end in the country—and before he had

actually turned his house over to the new tenants—he discovered that his neighbors had taken persuasive action. Someone had placed the nozzle of his garden hose through the mail drop in the front door and turned on the water. The entire lower floor of the house was flooded, and ruined were carpets, furniture, floors, and walls.

Regarding these two incidents in Los Angeles, perhaps the most telling comment was that made by the Reverend George H. Dunne, a Catholic clergyman, who wrote:

[These events] should remove any lingering doubts about the unfitness of Negroes to live in white neighborhoods. It is simply a matter of different levels of cultural refinement, of standards of social behavior. It should be sufficiently obvious that people like Mr. and Mrs. Wilson, who have not as yet acquired such refined social graces as the art of leaving dead rats on their neighbor's doorstep can hardly be assimilated into this kind of neighborhood. Let them stay over on Central Avenue [a Negro section] until through education they have raised themselves to a comparable cultural level. When they have learned to flood their neighbor's home, to leave dead rats on their neighbor's front porch, or, better still, to throw dead rats through their neighbor's open windows, they will be better equipped to meet the stringent standards of the white neighborhood. (*The Commonwealth*, October 6, 1950.)

This same pattern of intimidation has been repeated time and again throughout the United States. In Birmingham, Alabama, when Negroes sought to move into districts inhabited exclusively by whites, the first reaction was the enactment by city officials of a zoning ordinance to exclude persons, because of race, from living in certain residential areas. A Negro who had moved into the district enlisted the aid of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He sued and succeeded in having the Federal court invalidate the ordinance. Within forty-eight hours after the court's ruling was known, his home was bombed "by persons unknown." By late 1951 there were nine unsolved racial bombings in Birmingham.

In Chicago there were more than nineteen attacks on Negro residents over a five-month period—from January through May in 1951. In five of these cases, either bombing or arson was resorted to. Similar violence has occurred in Detroit, Baltimore, Spokane, Atlanta, Miami, Dallas, and other cities.

The victim of racial prejudice is not only the Jew and the Negro. Sometimes, it is the Catholic (as early as 1848, immigrants from Ireland found a sign at the port in Boston reading: "No Irish Catholics Wanted"). Or it may be the Mexican-American, the Italian, the Hungarian or Pole or Slovak, the Syrian, Greek, Armenian, Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Asiatic—the span is broad, and the discriminatory methods employed range from extreme violence to concealed hostility expressed by far more subtle means than bombings, fire, and flood.

Sometimes, the absurdity inherent in setting up false standards of racial supremacy becomes startlingly evident. In the spring of 1950, a distinguished South American diplomat, a descendant of Spanish aristocracy whose family moved in the highest circles of international society, had need of summer living quarters in New York City. Through mutual friends he arranged to sublet the luxurious Fifth Avenue apartment of a physician who was to go abroad for the summer. The latter was delighted to turn his apartment over to so eminent a guest; but before the apartment house management gave its approval, it sent an agent to call upon the diplomat in the hotel in which he was temporarily living. The agent explained that he had taken the liberty of dropping in on him simply to check last-minute details. After a few minutes' chat, the agent obsequiously bowed himself out. To a friend he said later: "I just wanted to see the color of his skin. Some of these South American characters are pretty dark, you know. He's all right. Very light brown complexion—looks sort of sun-tanned, that's all." He added seriously: "Lucky for him. I was prepared to tell him we'd made a mistake—that we had already sublet Dr. S.'s apart-

ment, and hadn't gotten round to notifying him. We'd have been able to get out of it somehow, if we wanted to."

Real estate interests maintain their restrictive policies in many ways. Sometimes they set up clubs or corporations to which the landowner deeds his land, and in return is allowed to use it but cannot sell it without the consent of the club or corporation—one of the schemes, it will be noted, which Joseph Beauharnais hopes to promote in Chicago. Another scheme calls for each landowner to give a prior option to purchase his land to the rest of the community. If he should need to sell and the purchaser is a member of a group excluded from the community, the community committee itself can exercise its option and buy the property, holding it pending ultimate sale to an approved buyer. Such schemes have not always proved too successful because the landowner is usually reluctant to give up full control of his property. But they are still in effect in many parts of the United States.

The visitor to Delray Beach, Florida, for example, about fifty miles from Miami, would find a delightfully pleasant resort mainly inhabited by former middle-westerners attracted by the climate and the opportunity to live next to the sea. But Delray Beach is notorious: it is a substantial community which boasts that it has erected walls against Americans of Jewish faith. Virtually the entire town observes a gentlemen's agreement which provides for no sales, no rentals, no occupancy—where Jews are concerned.

On March 9, 1951, in reply to an inquiry, Harry Gelatt, writing on the stationery of Dorothea E. Calvin, a registered real estate firm, wrote: "This is one of the long-established offices in Delray, and we have complete listings of the homes and businesses for sale. If you will write me just what you have in mind, I will be able to give you definite descriptions, prices, and photos of what is available, and give you our honest advice as to their worth."

He added: "All of Delray is near the ocean, much of it within walking distance. It is also the only city in the East Coast fully restricted to Gentiles, both to buying and renting."

These policies are no secret to the citizens of Delray. During a casual conversation in one of the drugstores in Delray, one man observed: "I don't know how they keep the Jews out. That's something the real estate men handle among themselves."

The advertising material sent out by other Delray establishments, it should be pointed out, is similar in nature.

Twenty miles down the famous "gold coast" of Florida is Fort Lauderdale, which has its own claim as a city of prejudice. A Connecticut resident who was interested in spending the winter in Fort Lauderdale wrote to one of the resort's realtors, M. W. Colter. He received a reply which read in part: "I would like to add that there exists an unwritten law among the realtors of Fort Lauderdale that we will not sell apartments to members of the Semitic race, as all apartments and hotels in Fort Lauderdale operate on a restricted clientele basis."

In Miami Beach, the largest resort community in the state, John B. Reid, president and managing director of the Marine Terrace Hotel, not only advertises his bigotry but capitalizes on it in a particularly offensive way. In February 1950, he mailed out a brochure describing the merits of his establishment. Attached to the brochure was a neatly mimeographed note, written in a rather curious literary style but quite clear in content:

#### IMPORTANT

The Good Hotel and the Shoremede Hotel—have recently changed hands, and will be operated by a local—"Operating Syndicate." And—apparently—will not cater to "a restricted type of Clientele"—we are informed—"as in previous years." This leaves—"just a few year-round Ocean Front Hotels"—catering to "our type of clientele," and will naturally—"increase the demand" for hotels of "our typical Mode of



Operation (Christian).” This will make “the demand” greater than “the supply of space.” We, therefore, urge that you make a definite reservation as soon as possible in order to be assured of “the desired and required accommodations.”

Not far from Florida, in Sea Island, Georgia, is one of the best-known hotels in the South—The Cloisters. It received attention in the press when Vice President Barkley and his wife visited there for several days. Shortly after this news appeared, Mr. and Mrs. Bert Sabin of Atlanta, Georgia, motored together with their grown children near Sea Island and decided that it might be a pleasant and memorable experience to have their lunch at the hotel—to dine in the same room where the Vice President of the United States had dined.

Mr. Sabin found that before entering the dining room it was necessary to register at the desk. The clerk looked at his name and then at Mr. Sabin. He was not so vulgar as to ask embarrassing questions aloud. Instead he turned the card over, wrote on the blank side, “Gentile?,” and pushed it back with a glance that was at once inquiring and apologetic. Mr. Sabin, to be sure, bore himself as a gentleman; he looked like a gentleman and he spoke like one. But his reply would reveal what personal path he followed to God; and no Nazi interrogator in Hitler Germany had his duty more clearly cut out for him than did this clerk at a hotel right here in America. On that reply depended whether Mr. Sabin would be permitted to eat in a public inn in the United States.

Standing next to Mr. Sabin, watching in silence, was his son-in-law, a soldier in World War II and a veteran of the campaign in Korea. Sabin glanced at the younger man and, as his eyes went back to the scribbled word “Gentile?” he thought of many things he wanted to say. Instead, he contented himself with just shaking his head in the negative.

The clerk placed the pen back on the register. “I’m sorry,” he said, “this hotel is for Christians only.”

The indignities of this nature suffered by some Americans might well shake their faith in their country. In September 1951, Lawrence Wener of New York drove with his wife and children to New Hampshire, to enjoy a leisurely, Indian summer vacation. Toward evening they drew up to a beautiful motel on Lake Winnepesaukee. Wener rented a housekeeping cottage from the owner, Carl Hansen, who asked for no deposit but made it clear that the cottage was Wener's. He even suggested the location of a grocery in the village where Wener might procure supplies for his family.

Wener, with his family still in the car, drove to the village, bought his groceries, and then drove back to the cottage—only to find the door was locked. He sent his young son to Hansen's office to inquire. The boy returned with Hansen.

"You're not of the Christian faith, are you?" Hansen asked. Wener shook his head. "Well, I can't rent this cottage to you. I have a policy of not taking in Jews here."

After some argument, Hansen refunded the money Wener had spent for the groceries, and Wener and his family drove away. The following day they stopped at a hotel in Hampton Beach. Here the hotel proprietor informed Wener that "even though you're Jewish, I'll let you stay." And he added: "But if the Chamber of Commerce knew I was giving accommodations to anyone of the Jewish faith, they'd boycott me. I have to be careful. Let's just keep it quiet."

The current files of the Anti-Defamation League make shocking reading with respect to resort discrimination. Though the records are not exhaustive—they cannot possibly list every hotel and resort community in the United States which defines free citizenship in terms of faith or creed—they reveal 675 hotels in 21 states where prejudice is a matter of public record. The States are in the North, South, East, and West; the language used by these establishments ranges from unashamed

declarations of bigotry to elegantly evasive phrases which convey the same ugly meaning.

Years ago the words were simply "We do not accept Jews" or "Gentiles Only." Later many of these were changed to the more discreet "Restricted Clientele." In the past two years the most popular phrases have been: "Near Churches" and "Transportation to Churches," as though this new-found concern for the religious needs of a hotel's guests would take the onus from its un-Christian practices.

It would be amusing, were it not so bitter a commentary upon democracy, to note these elaborate attempts by troublemakers in this field to carry out their prejudices while at the same time maintaining a façade of respectability. Innumerable variations are played upon the same anti-Semitic theme. The North Point Club at Raquette Lake, New York, informs prospective guests that they may be assured of "Seclusion in good Christian company." Hawthorne Inn and Cottages in Mount Pocono, Pennsylvania, sanctimoniously advertises: "References from . . . rector, priest, or minister of a church," invoking religion to support its bigotry. Paradise Inn, Phoenix, Arizona, confers its own accolade of snobbery upon its guests: "Our clientele is restricted as much as that of the most exclusive club." The Verde Cattle and Guest Ranch in Paulden, Arizona, makes this hospitable observation: "Being Gentiles, we naturally wish only such to visit our homes"—not only introducing the novel suggestion that Gentiles should fraternize only with Gentiles, and Jews only with Jews, but also conveniently forgetting that paying guests at a commercial inn can scarcely be described as visitors to one's "home." The Topside, Boothbay Harbor, Maine, limits itself to "Discriminating Clientele." The Pines at Cotuit, Massachusetts, observes with both delicacy and firmness: "We would much prefer not to entertain patronage of Hebraic origin." Sharpe's Resort in Elkhart Lake, Wisconsin, simply

ignores requests from Jews from accommodations, and advertises: "Patronized by congenial American people."

Camelback Inn in Phoenix, Arizona, in reply to Jewish queries states unequivocally that "Camelback has held unswervingly to a one-hundred-per-cent Gentile clientele following since its opening." But its literature speaks about the "Congenial group of outstanding families who gather here annually."

The much publicized Homestead in Hot Springs, Virginia, self-described as "America's most distinguished country hotel," in its literature speaks eloquently of its charm and graciousness and of "a small minority of persons who intuitively recognize and appreciate the truly finer things of life." In a reply to a travel agent who asked for reservations for two Jewish couples, the Homestead, however, descended sharply from its polished language to state bluntly and with no little annoyance, "We will not have space for these two couples in October as you requested. I don't know where you get the information that we want Jewish patronage . . . We take none that we can possibly help and under no circumstances ever pay a commission on such business."

The very polite Martha Washington Hotel at Virginia Beach, Virginia, writes guests that while its welcome "is extended to white members of Protestant and Catholic churches, no offense is meant to any other religious group or any color or race of people." The hotel just doesn't want them around, that's all!

The Monomonock Inn, Mountainhome, Pennsylvania, uses this fantastic measuring rod to practice its un-American policy: "It might be well to mention that we operate exclusively on a restricted basis, and do not accept reservations from those of the Hebrew faith, and only those of the Italian nationality of the higher caliber who are free from Jewish appearances."

Such a list can be prolonged almost indefinitely.

It is not, of course, only individual hotel owners who exhibit religious bias. Frequently—as Mr. Wener's experience underlines—individuals may feel guilty of the bias they show, but claim that they are compelled to follow the pattern established by real estate and other interests in the community. It is fascinating to pull back the curtain and observe how many different and varied influences join together to perpetuate such discrimination.

Basic is the belief among many property owners that when members of minority groups move into their neighborhoods their investment in their homes is jeopardized, real estate values drop, and the neighborhood promptly becomes less desirable. But there are other pressures and forces at work. Owners of local businesses, local political bosses, and leaders of local civic and religious groups who have a stake in maintaining the neighborhood status quo may also fight against the entry of minority groups. They argue that any change in the business, political, or religious composition of their neighborhood will injure their interests.

All these groups may join in efforts to keep the neighborhood as it is, and to encourage the creation of a self-contained, self-sufficient, ghetto-minded minority group. They justify their attitude by claiming that the inhabitants desire to remain as they are.

Years ago the argument might have had some validity. In the early 1900s, millions of European immigrants came to this country. They came to a strange land, ignorant of its language and its folkways and the prey of economic fears and insecurities. It was inevitable that they would herd together, settle near each other, and form nationality islands in the big cities. At about the same time, many Negroes came up from the South. Like the European immigrants, they tended to find lodging near each other; and both groups—Europeans and Negroes—because of

their low economic status settled in the less expensive, older, downtown industrial areas.

But as they bettered their economic condition, they followed in the footsteps of other Americans. They sought to move to the more desirable suburbs.

Many of the Europeans were able to do this. The Negroes were not so fortunate. They met an unwillingness to rent or sell homes to them; and if they found someone who did sell, they met definite hostility and worse. The great majority consequently remained in the poorer areas. Time and again the Negroes sought to leave their depressed neighborhoods; time and again they met strong barriers. Ironically, much of the hostility toward them came from the very European immigrants and first-generation Americans who had succeeded in entering the more fashionable areas. They feared their new-found social status would be endangered. They quickly joined efforts to organize neighborhood associations and property owners' groups, and otherwise sought to prevent the lower-status groups from breaking into the community.

Another pattern has made itself evident—stemming from compulsory segregation; that is, segregation maintained by law. The first compulsory housing segregation developed in San Francisco as the result of the influx of Chinese into the West Coast in response to labor needs. The city passed a statute limiting Chinese residence to a small area. The Federal Court struck this down. Nonetheless, through agreement among San Francisco landowners, the Chinese continued to be restricted to a small area even though their numbers increased. Presently San Francisco's Chinatown became an extremely overcrowded district, and soon it deteriorated into a slum.

Here came the sort of irony which has plagued housing experts through the decades: a kind of logic-in-reverse which is constantly invoked by those seeking to perpetuate segregation. For San Francisco's white population, which itself had brought

about this slum condition, cited it as proof of the need for continued segregation of the Chinese. The Chinese lived in slums—never mind who forced the creation of those slums—hence if allowed to live anywhere else, the Chinese would make slums there, too.

This argument was not only unfair, it was untrue. The mere entrance of any minority group into a neighborhood does not tend to depreciate property values and create slums. Where the market value of real estate drops when a minority family first moves in, it is solely from a hysterical fear, which is in no way related to the true value of the real estate. If owners would not rush to sell as soon as one “undesirable” family moves in, the chain of cause and effect would not be established.

Studies have shown that where Negro families, for example, move into white areas, they usually are compelled to pay exorbitant prices despite the apparent fall in real estate values. Panic—not any decrease in value—causes the flight from a neighborhood and the resultant decline in value. Frequently, holders of mortgages succumb to the same hysteria: they begin to press for payment or for a drastic reduction of the mortgage principal. Lending institutions add to the panic by refusing to finance the purchase of such property. Ultimately, land and buildings in the neighborhood are permitted to deteriorate: then, finally, there is a real drop in values.

What is significant is that this result never occurs unless the white owners succumb to panic, sell their houses to the first buyers at the first price offered them, and thus start an avalanche of descending prices.

How baseless this fear of minorities is was underscored by a rent study in Chicago. This dealt with protests raised by owners of land in the vicinity of projected public housing projects which would include large numbers of minority group tenants. They insisted that the erection of such housing projects would depreciate the value of their surrounding property. Robert R.

Taylor, chairman of the Chicago Housing Authority, replied by citing the experience with three large housing projects—the Trumbull Park Homes, Altgeld Gardens, and West Chesterfield Homes.

He attacked what he called the “misinformation or deliberate misrepresentations calculated to arouse the antagonism of property owners,” and went on:

“*Olcott's Blue Book*, the standard reference of land values in the City of Chicago, shows what the real facts are. Let me take them up project by project.

“Trumbull Park was completed in 1938. In 1937 the commercial corner of 106th St. and Torrence Ave. (close to Trumbull Park) had a value of \$25 per front foot. In 1939, a year after Trumbull Park was built, the same property had risen to a value of \$30 per front foot. From 1940 through 1944 the front foot value had gone up \$75; in 1946, to \$85; in 1947, to \$125; and in 1948–49 the land was valued at \$150 per front foot.

“In one of the other blocks bounding Trumbull Park which is devoted to residential use . . . the value per front foot in 1937, when Trumbull Park was completed, was \$8. In 1939, a year after Trumbull was built, the front foot value of this land had risen to \$8.50 per front foot, and has risen steadily from 1940 onward and in 1949 had a value of \$21 per front foot.

“Altgeld Gardens was built in 1944. Land located . . . just south of the project had a value in 1942 of \$400 an acre. In 1945 this land had risen in value to \$450 an acre, and in 1947 and 1948 had achieved a value of \$500 per acre. There is no value listed for 1949 in *Olcott's Blue Book*.

“Finally, let us consider West Chesterfield Homes, a project that was bitterly contested by the neighborhood at the time that it was built. Commercial land bounding the project was valued in 1945, before Chesterfield was completed, at \$25 per front foot. In 1947 and 1948, it commanded a value of \$30 per front foot, and the most recent 1949 listing shows it to have a value of \$35 per front foot.

“Residential property bounding West Chesterfield Homes . . . the year before West Chesterfield was completed, had a value of \$16 per front foot. In 1946, the year after the project was completed, this figure had risen to \$18 per front foot. In 1947 the value jumped to



**\$25 per front foot, and in 1948 and 1949 has remained steady at that figure."**

**Unfortunately these facts are not known to most persons who continue to confuse cause and effect. As property owners, they still believe property values are adversely affected and that their own stake is jeopardized.**

**There are those who believe that when different groups are compelled to live together, friction is inevitable; and that frequently violence must result. They argue, too, that, in the last analysis, people prefer to "live with their own kind."**

**The record gives the lie to these claims. It is particularly revealing with respect to Negroes and whites living as neighbors in public housing projects. Marin City, California, boasts one of the most successful wartime housing projects on the West Coast. Here was a situation in which thousands of war workers were needed. A flood of men and women poured into the area, both colored and white. From the very beginning the management refused to follow a policy of discrimination. Negro applicants were dispersed throughout the housing projects, rather than segregated in special projects or in separate buildings of a mixed project. When some whites objected to having Negro neighbors, they were asked why they objected. The Negroes, they alleged, were noisy. Well, went the reply, some of the whites were noisy, too. Instead of moving the Negroes into a special building segregated from the whites—as had been suggested—would it not be more logical to move the noisemakers, white and Negro both, into a separate building? There was no answer to this. The management notified all tenants that accommodations were to be made available irrespective of race, religion, or color. If difficulty arose because of racial prejudice on the part of any tenants, those tenants would be asked to move. The project is now nine years old and fourteen hundred families of all races and creeds are living together in harmony.**

Many cities are in transition. In some, segregation is still maintained in public housing, but it is slowly vanishing, as project after project proves that whites and Negroes can live together amicably—if once they grow to know each other and discover that many of their previous fears and apprehensions, growing out of stereotyped opinions of each other, are without foundation.

That amity can exist between people of different racial backgrounds—that the anticipated friction grows out of false beliefs about persons of other races—was confirmed by a fascinating study made by Morton Deutsch and Mary Collins of New York University's Research Center of Human Relations. They wanted to determine exactly what happened, so far as attitudes toward other races were concerned, when Negroes and whites were brought together as neighbors. For their study, they took white and Negro housewives living in four separate public housing projects—two racially integrated projects in New York City and two bi-racial projects in Newark, New Jersey. (A bi-racial project is one in which Negroes live in one building or section of the project and whites in another.) The four projects were selected because they were about the same size, had about the same ratio of Negroes to whites, were in about the same socio-economic class and—not the least important—because the attitudes of the whites toward Negroes before they moved in were substantially the same.

In all, approximately one hundred white housewives and twenty-five Negro housewives were questioned. As was obvious, in the integrated projects white and Negro housewives knew each other far better, for they had much greater opportunity to meet—in the building itself, at the laundry facilities, and at the playground.

The results are well worth consideration. Almost three times as many women in the segregated projects, when they described Negroes to the interviewers, used such words as “ag-

gressive," "dangerous," "noisy." On the other hand, in the integrated projects, such words were rarely used. Instead, the white housewives here frequently described their Negro neighbors as "sensitive" or suffering from "inferiority complexes" or "shy"—phrases disclosing completely contradictory verdicts on the Negroes.

One housewife who lived side by side with her Negro neighbors in an integrated project told an interviewer:

"I started to cry when my husband told me we were coming to live here . . . I didn't want to come to live where there are so many colored people, but we had to have a place . . . Well, that's all changed. I have really come to like it. I see they're just as human as we are. They've nice apartments, they keep their children clean, and they're very friendly. I've come to like them a great deal. I'm no longer scared. I'd just as soon live near a colored person as a white, it makes no difference to me."

Another white woman said:

"I was prejudiced when I moved in here, but not any more. They're just people . . . they're not any different. I know them, I've been in their homes and to church with them."

In the integrated projects, there were two housewives who wanted to be friendly with Negroes as against one housewife who wished to avoid contact with them. In the segregated projects, however, for one white housewife who wished to be friendly to Negroes, there were ten who wished to avoid any contact. When one remembers that all the white housewives before moving into any of the projects had approximately the same attitudes toward Negroes, this is eloquent proof that when people live together their racial prejudices tend to diminish.

There is an inspiring story—with a moral of its own—to be found in the experience of one American family in the city of Omaha. In a way, it symbolizes the greater battle that must be fought.

In the past ten years the Negro population of Omaha has nearly doubled. As a result, more and more Negroes are moving into "fringe" areas. One of these new residents was Woodrow Morgan, a World War II Air Force veteran, who had been shot down over Germany and spent several months in a Nazi prisoner-of-war camp. He had seen the enemies of democracy in Europe: he was to see them again in his own country.

He purchased a home, from a white owner, at 1822 North 31st St., in a neighborhood which was white. As soon as news of the sale became known, there was an ugly reaction. Neighbors protested. Morgan received threatening letters. Furious telephone calls were made to the white man who had sold him the house, to the financing corporation, and to the real estate agent who had negotiated the sale. The white seller and his family hurriedly moved out, leaving the house vacant for the Morgans to move in.

Neighborhood hoodlums immediately took over. They threw stones through the windows and threatened bodily harm to Morgan and his family if they dared to move in.

The neighborhood was predominantly Catholic. The story of what was taking place was told to Father John Markoe, a Jesuit leader and a highly respected member of the Creighton University faculty. Father Markoe decided he would meet the issue in his own way.

On the morning when the moving van was expected, Father Markoe and one of his white students sat on the porch of the vacant house. Several neighbors walked by. They asked if the priest was looking for the old tenants.

Father Markoe replied: "No, we're waiting for the new owners. We're helping them move in."

When the moving van approached, a group of young Negro and white men alighted and helped carry in the furniture. The neighbors, organized for threatening action, stood by, astounded. Here was the clergy, whom they respected. Here

was clear evidence that the entry into their community of this new neighbor, which they had looked upon as an evil, was indeed quite the opposite: here were whites and Negroes working together, and their own spiritual leader first among them.

The hostility toward the Morgans has melted away. Woodrow Morgan and his family have been accepted as neighbors—accepted on their merits as Americans.



# 9

## VIOLENT HARVEST

Violence—and even murder—are the logical consequences of bigotry carried to its ultimate end. Such was the case in the crime of genocide against the Jews of Nazi Germany. Such is the case in Klan lynchings in the South. From organized propaganda against Jews, Negroes, Catholics, and other minorities, from attempts to segregate them in housing, and from the whipping up of passions and resentments, it is not a long step to physical force—in which the bigoted take matters into their own hands.

In 1951, this happened on the nights of July 10, 11, and 12 in the Chicago suburb of Cicero. Many of the troublemakers responsible for what took place are still unknown—but their work on those nights has become known throughout the world.

Cicero has a population of about seventy thousand; most of its wage earners work for the Western Electric Company or the Hurley Manufacturing Company. They represent more than twenty-two nationality groups, with a predominance of persons of Slovak, Polish, Lithuanian, Italian, and German origin, in that order.

But there were no Negroes living

in Cicero. Harvey E. Clark, Jr., a twenty-nine-year-old Negro war veteran and graduate of Fisk University, was not aware of this fact. He and his wife, Johnetta, and their two children, aged eight and six, lived in one half of a small two-room apartment on Chicago's South Side. It was obviously unsuitable: the place was vermin-infested; and it was twenty-four miles from the terminal where Clark started and ended his daily run as a bus driver. The rent was \$56 a month.

When, in March 1951, Clark found the five-room apartment at 6132-42 West 19th Street, in Cicero, he was delighted. The rent was \$60 a month, the apartment was in a building which had been bought by a group of Negroes some time before, and the place was clean and modern.

On March 8, the Clarks loaded their furniture into a moving van and drove up before the building on West 19th Street. They were met by Charles S. Edwards, a rental agent, who was there to help them—and some members of the Cicero police force.

The police would not let the furniture be moved into the building without a permit—although subsequent investigation did not disclose the need for such a permit in any other case.

Mr. Edwards described the events that followed in an affidavit:

About 6 P.M. the Chief of Police of Cicero rushed out of the alley near by followed by about twenty men and rushed up and grabbed my arm. The police in cars out front got out of their cars and rushed up toward us. The chief said to me, "You should know better—get going—get out of here fast. There will be no moving into this building. I'm not going to endanger the lives of nineteen families for the likes of you."

During these statements, the chief held my left arm with his strong left arm and he kept hitting me in the back with his right fist, especially at my right shoulder and on my right side below the shoulder. He hit me about eight times while he was pushing me ahead of him toward my car which was parked across the street. I was trying to walk, but he was trying to make me move faster.



When we reached my car, I opened the door and the chief shoved me inside and said, "Get out of Cicero and don't come back in town or you'll get a bullet through you." There were three-four officers with the chief . . . I have not been back to Cicero since and my clients, the Clarks, have not been allowed to move into the apartment which is theirs.

Edwards and Clark brought the matter to the attention of local civic agencies. They in turn decided to bring criminal prosecution against Cicero's civil authorities under the United States code which prohibits a conspiracy to deprive citizens by force and violence of their right of freedom of movement. They also filed a \$200,000 damage suit against Cicero.

U. S. District Judge John P. Barnes issued a temporary injunction restraining the town and its officials from "shooting, beating, or otherwise harrassing Mr. Clark and his family." He warned Cicero officials: "If you don't obey the order, you're going to be in serious trouble . . . You're going to exercise the same diligence in seeing that these people move in as you did in trying to keep them out."

The Illinois Interracial Commission, the Chicago Council Against Discrimination, and other groups tried to help prepare the community for the Clarks' arrival as tenants of the building. The Church Federation of Greater Chicago requested all Protestant ministers in Cicero and near-by Berwyn to make a statement from their pulpits, asking their people to maintain peace and order.

Then came the troublemakers.

The Clarks moved their furniture into the apartment building on Tuesday, July 10. A crowd gathered that night and broke the windows of the Clark apartment with stones.

Rumors swept the town the following morning. The other nineteen tenants moved out most of their furniture during the day to save it from destruction. By 7:30 P.M. of the night of July 11, some eight hundred people had gathered outside the

building. By the time darkness had set in, the eight hundred had swelled to more than four thousand. It was a wild, noisy crowd, composed of people of all ages, including women and children. An American Civil Liberties Union observer reported:

The most active were teen-agers, some in gangs. Police did nothing to break up the gangs . . . Police watched women pass stones from a rock pile back to the throwers in the crowd, and made no effort to stop them. The police, for the most part, were in a jovial mood, cracked jokes with the crowd and some made Jim Crow remarks . . . Firecrackers were thrown and one man, said to be a plain-clothesman, went up to the group of kids, and was heard to say, "Cut out the firecrackers. In case you're searched, don't have any on you. We don't care how many stones you throw, but get rid of the firecrackers."

The frames of the windows of the Clark apartment were knocked out. A gang went upstairs, vandalized the apartment, and turned on gas and water. Furniture was thrown out the window and set afire by the people below.

At 11:30 P.M. the gang was in the basement, tearing up the plumbing. One member ran out of the building to report that his group was losing to the police downstairs. A larger gang rushed to help. For ten minutes the police effectively held back the mob with tear gas—then the gang took control.

Cook County Sheriff Babb tried to disperse the crowd. A police loudspeaker blared that the Clarks had agreed not to return to the apartment—a false report, incidentally. The Clarks were miles away from the scene at the time but too aghast by the events to make any decision at the moment.

Past midnight, youngsters pulled down a half-dozen poplar trees in front of the apartment house. The mob cheered and applauded as each twenty-five-foot tree snapped and fell.

The following morning, Thursday, July 12, Sheriff Babb was informed that nightfall would again bring out the mob. In the absence of the mayor of Cicero—on vacation in Antioch, Il-

linois—the Sheriff called Governor Adlai Stevenson, requesting that National Guard Units be sent to Cicero to restore peace.

The guardsmen arrived at Cicero Town Hall at 7:30 P.M. Before they were summoned into action, the sheriff's deputies and as many other police as could be gathered from neighboring Cook County towns were assigned to keep the fast-gathering crowd in order. The police formed a cordon at all intersections within two blocks of the building. By 9:30 the mob had grown to about five thousand persons and had broken through the police lines.

The guardsmen were called into action. They stood shoulder to shoulder, bayonets poised, to keep the mob from surging closer to the building. For an hour they all stood their ground—the police, the young soldiers, and the mob which continued to throw stones and flares and firecrackers. Then the guardsmen slowly pushed the crowd back as it heaped abuse upon them: “Got a nigger in your knapsack, Johnny?” Stones dented the soldiers' helmets, policemen were hit, police cars were overturned, members of the mob were cut by bayonets. In the end, the mob retreated.

Nineteen people were injured. The police arrested about seventy persons. By 3:00 A.M., the sound of fury had subsided, the stone-throwers were gone. The guardsmen stayed on duty during the next few days to forestall any further rioting.

The damage to the building was estimated at about \$25,000; the damage to the Clarks, at more than \$7,000—gone, their furniture, including a piano, and their children's toys—but the major damage was done to the United States of America.

The rioting in Cicero was an ideal situation for exploitation by Communist propagandists throughout the world. They seized upon it in an attempt to show the sharp distinction between promise and practice in American democracy—the hypocrisy of a nation which abroad preaches brotherhood of man,

human dignity, and equality of the individual, while at home dividing its citizens into different classes.

The most appalling and frightening fact of all was that the Communists did not need to exaggerate or distort the event. All they had to do was to publish pictures of the grinning, shouting rioters; pictures of the broken walls; stories of the mob's fury as its members threw the Clark's piano out of the window. All they had to do was write about Harvey Clark's war record and compare it to the opportunity offered him by his fellow Americans after he left the Army. The Communists, from Italy to China, played it straight—and they could not have played it better.

Not only the Communists seized upon the incident. When Governor Dewey of New York arrived in Singapore during his 1951 tour of the Far East, the *Singapore Straits Times*—no Communist publication—had the Cicero story spread across its front page, complete to mob photographs.

The effect of this—of the story with all its overtones—cannot be underestimated. No explanation can undo the damage.

The churches of Cicero did little to stop the rioters or to appeal to reason. Perhaps they couldn't, for prejudice was at white heat. As a matter of fact, only three of Cicero's twenty ministers were brave enough to comment on the riot on the Sunday following the event. There was, too, some evidence of professional agitation among the mob. Joseph Beauharnais and other White Circle League followers mingled with the crowd and started to chant "Go, Go, Go! Keep Cicero white!" This was picked up by some of the mob during the height of the riot. But the core of the trouble went far deeper than the White Circle League.

The people in the mob apparently believed the propaganda that had been disseminated by word of mouth, and printed in publications and in letters to the editor days before the riot broke out. The propaganda had emphasized that the "security" of the white people of Cicero and their very homes were at

stake. Somewhere underneath the whole picture was a current of false anti-Communism, the belief that this "trouble"—a Negro family moving into Cicero—had been instigated by Communists, although there is no shred of evidence that this was the case. Respect for authority had lessened step by step through the years in Cicero. The fact that this city was for years the center of crime syndicates could not be disregarded.

In 1948 there had been another incident revealing deep-seated racial antagonisms in Cicero. John Stoffel, former village president, urged that the Cicero city government be changed to a city commission plan. A referendum vote was held. The night before the voters went to the polls, thousands of them found in their mailboxes a leaflet, purportedly put out by Negroes, urging everyone to vote for the referendum "so that Negroes can live in Cicero." The measure was roundly defeated.

What happened in Cicero was, of course, a moral problem: and it was faced as such by constructive forces in the Chicago community, whose joint efforts led to constructive community action. Directing this program were representatives of the Anti-Defamation League and other civic, labor, religious, and human relations groups, all constituents of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination.

Among other steps taken, the Law and Order Committee of the Council, headed by the A.D.L. Civil Rights Director in Chicago, asked for a Grand Jury investigation and urged the State's Attorney to prosecute rioters arrested on the scene. The State's Attorney was furnished with a list of on-the-spot witnesses for possible use by the Cook County Grand Jury. Information was also furnished the FBI, which investigated violations of Federal civil rights statutes. In late September the Grand Jury indicted Cicero Police Chief Erwin Konovsky, charging him with misconduct in public office—but it also indicted the owner and renting agent of the building and Clark's attorney.

## 9 VIOLENT HARVEST

This was immediately denounced by the Chicago Council as even worse than a whitewash or miscarriage of justice: not only had the guilty city officials and members of the mob been exonerated, but blameless persons now faced prosecution.

However, the United States Attorney General's office, acting on the results of FBI investigations, appointed a special Federal prosecutor to present the evidence to the local Federal Grand Jury. In the last month of 1951, the Grand Jury handed down an indictment charging the police and fire chiefs, the town president, town attorney, and several Cicero policemen, with conspiracy and violation of the equal rights laws.

Cicero revealed the end result of racial and religious propaganda upon adult Americans. Bigotry, once instilled in the parent, inevitably infects the child—and its manifestations there are equally ugly and terrifying. If a mob of men and women in Cicero used stones against a Negro, during this same period teen-aged youths in Boston unleashed not only stones, but bits of rubber hose, baseball bats, and metal belt buckles in a racial battle not far from the site of the Boston Massacre of 1771.

Here, again, members of a minority group—this time Jews—were the victims.

In the summer and autumn of 1950, violence flared intermittently in greater Boston, reaching an ugly climax in a near riot in Dorchester, a heavily populated Jewish area. Seventeen anti-Semitic assaults were perpetrated from June through September, 1950, in the city's metropolitan area. In Malden, a community with a Jewish population of ten thousand, three Jews—one a disabled World War II veteran—were beaten. In Chelsea, three teen-aged Jewish girls were assaulted. In Dorchester, five boys, one a European refugee whose parents had died in a concentration camp, were so severely beaten that they needed medical attention. In Revere, they desecrated a marker commemorating a Jewish soldier killed in action. In Haverhill,

outside of Boston, vandals damaged a new Jewish community center.

The widespread violence which began on the evening of October 26, 1950, at Hecht House, a settlement center sponsored by Jews in Dorchester, was not, therefore, totally unexpected.

It was a Thursday evening when three boys, not Jewish, and obviously under the influence of liquor, created a disturbance at the community center. Hecht House has traditionally extended its privileges to Christian youth in that area. But the three boys used obscene and inflammatory language, hurled anti-Semitic epithets, and started a fight. Two Jewish boys ejected them. Another fight developed outside the entrance. One of the drunken youths came off a bad second-best.

The following day a Jewish boy received a warning note that "you Hecht House Jews" better "watch out." Immediately word flashed through the area that a gang from the near-by Hyde Park section planned to invade the settlement house to avenge the beating given the two drunken youths.

The threat was translated into action the following Tuesday evening—Halloween night, October 31. An appropriate celebration was under way in Hecht House, which included dancing and free refreshments—part of a city-sponsored plan to combat juvenile delinquency.

Because of the special occasion and the rumors of impending trouble, nearly a thousand persons gathered in the area of the settlement house. But while no trouble occurred inside the building, there were a series of individual brutal assaults—mostly against Jewish youngsters—in and around the poorly lit roads leading to Hecht House.

As the evening progressed, it became evident that these attacks were part of a plan of anti-Jewish reprisals. The first attack occurred about 8:30 P.M. As a youth approached Hecht House through a rear entrance, he was suddenly confronted by a

group of six assailants. They beat him severely with sticks and a baseball bat. A police patrol wagon rushed him to City Hospital. Ironically enough, this first victim was not a Jewish boy. His name was David Sault, which "sounded" Jewish, and his best friend was a Jew—facts evidently sufficient for his attackers.

An hour later, two Jewish boys, aged sixteen and seventeen, were set upon by fifteen youths who apparently had been hiding in ambush on a road leading to Hecht House. One of the two, Milton Segal, was beaten with a tire chain, his nose broken, and his face lacerated. He, too, was taken to City Hospital for treatment.

Later a group of unidentified youths massed in front of Hecht House and loudly demanded: "Send out Digger!" ("Digger" was the nickname of the Jewish boy who had been involved in the original fight.)

News of the trouble in the Hecht House area spread rapidly through Dorchester and Roxbury. Alarmed residents who telephoned the local police headquarters were told, however, that no incidents had been reported. A later perusal of the police blotter revealed no accurate or complete report of the incidents. The case of the youth beaten with a baseball bat and hospitalized was listed as an accident—"falling off embankment." The case of young Segal, who had been attacked with a tire chain and also hospitalized, did not appear on the blotter at all.

As the days went by, tension mounted in the neighborhood. There was an increasing unrest among students in high schools in Dorchester, Roxbury, Mattapan, and Hyde Park. At the Roxbury Memorial High School for Girls, a Jewish girl was accosted by a student in the school cafeteria and warned: "We're coming up to Hecht House and get you Jew-bastards with knives!" The next gathering at Hecht House was scheduled for November 2—and trouble was anticipated. The A.D.L.'s Boston office, the Jewish Community Council, and Hecht House



continued to receive numerous anonymous phone calls warning that dire things were to happen.

On the afternoon of November 2, Police Commissioner Thomas F. Sullivan and representatives of the Anti-Defamation League, the Jewish Community Council, and Hecht House, met to discuss what should be done. The Commissioner at first was reluctant to believe that the trouble was—as he put it—“racial.” He contended it was all merely part of a general, city-wide problem of vandalism and hoodlumism. He finally agreed to furnish adequate police protection that evening at Hecht House.

At 7 P.M., a police sergeant and seventeen officers were guarding all entrances and exits to Hecht House or scouting the surrounding fields and streets. In addition, several police squad cars were cruising through the entire area. Inside Hecht House, the usual dance, attended by several hundred teen-agers, had begun uneventfully. But several observers became suspicious when they saw small groups of Jewish youngsters leaving the settlement building and reassembling at the Bowladrome, a bowling alley about a mile away. There, the boys piled into trucks and automobiles and set out for another destination. It was learned that the gang, mostly Jewish, was about to take revenge on the Hyde-Parkers responsible for the long series of anti-Semitic assaults.

Meanwhile, in the Hyde Park section, a group of Gentile youths armed with rocks and other weapons had massed at Lexington and River streets, reportedly awaiting a signal to attack the boys in the Jewish neighborhood. Within a space of moments, the Dorchesterites arrived, and the Hyde-Parkers braced themselves for the attack.

At this point a police officer appeared and held the warring factions at bay with a drawn revolver. He warned that he would shoot anyone who moved. But the Hyde-Parkers broke ranks and, running in several directions, escaped. The Jewish “gang”

—which included two Christian members—stood motionless in face of the gun. Police reinforcements arrived after the Gentile youths had vanished, and they arrested twenty-five of the Jewish faction. Eighteen boys, nearly all Jewish, were released on \$25 bail each after being booked on charges of participating in an affray. One Christian boy and five Jewish boys were held in \$500 bail each, the police having found an unloaded .38-caliber revolver in their car. The Jewish boy who owned the car was held in \$1000 bail. The Boston Jewish Community Council representative, present at the scene, provided bail for most of the boys involved.

Boston newspapers devoted serious attention to the disturbance. The *Herald* declared editorially on November 4:

Anti-Semitism and other race biases are not new in Boston and one is tempted to dismiss these incidents as boy stuff and unavoidable. But gang fights of this sort can't be taken lightly. They are symptoms of tensions which may burst forth in still more serious form if they are not understood and relieved in time. They are a community problem and the community must face them . . .

What the Hyde Park incident does most clearly call for is a re-dedication of all the agencies, both public and private, now working in the race relations field to a speedy diagnosis and prescription for this set of recurrent symptoms. The police may not be able to anticipate the next outbreak, and any blood that flows would be on all our hands . . .

The Boston *Traveler* asserted:

Fortunately, the youth-gang warfare that flared up briefly this week in Dorchester and Hyde Park has more of the coloration of juvenile delinquency than of anti-Semitism. But there are disturbing overtones of minority persecution in the incident, and the action of the police in the case leaves something to be desired . . .

It seems to us that the police of both communities could have prevented the raid from happening. Earlier vigilance could have blocked this action and given time for the understandably heated feelings of the Dorchester boys to cool off. When there is the possibility that brawls between groups of youths will take on a racial cast,

the police should be doubly careful. In this case, they apparently were not. We suggest a thorough investigation of the incident with a view to preparing the police better to deal with such nasty situations.

That such gang fights could not be "taken lightly," as the *Boston Herald* had declared, was made distressingly evident in the days that followed.

On Friday, November 3, the night following the riot, a Roxbury youth, assaulted by a group of unidentified boys, reported that he "had been beaten by the Jews." Warnings were received that "reprisal" gangs would invade the Dorchester area. Extra police were dispatched. No incident took place.

On Saturday, another raid was rumored—and again failed to materialize. On Sunday, two teen-aged Jewish girls were pursued by a gang of boys armed with sticks and pieces of rock, who shouted anti-Semitic scurrilities at them. Two nights later, a Jewish youth was assaulted as he was returning home from the Morton Hebrew School in the Dorchester area, and two women in the neighborhood were molested by a gang of youths who shouted, "Come on out, you dirty Jews! We're going to stone and kill you!"

At Mattapan, on November 19, windows were smashed in the new Dorchester Hebrew School. Four private homes in the same section were similarly damaged.

On December 2, as a group of Jewish boys were leaving a local movie in Brookline, a bus packed with teen-aged boys drew up alongside. They shouted anti-Semitic insults at the Jewish boys, and when the bus stopped for a traffic light, some of the hoodlums leaped out shouting, "Let's kill the goddam Jews!" The Jewish boys—who were outnumbered—quickly scattered, but in the subsequent confusion, two teen-agers who "looked Jewish" were caught and severely beaten.

On Thanksgiving Day, Bostonians were subjected to another riot, which, this time, involved Irish and Italian schoolboys. The

trouble resulted from rivalry over the annual football game, at Franklin Park's White Stadium, between teams representing the predominantly Italian section of East Boston and the South Boston "Irish."

Four persons were hospitalized in the course of this melee—one in serious condition—and scores of others were cut and bruised in the disturbances which began outside the Stadium and spilled over into the city's subways.

The Thanksgiving Day trouble had always been regarded as a more-or-less "traditional" event; fifty persons had been hurt in a similar brawl after the 1949 game, and the 1948 contest had also ended in conflict among the spectators.

In April and May, 1951, a new series of outbursts struck Boston, and particularly the Dorchester-Roxbury district. Beatings, ambushes, and pitched battles took place at Blue Hill Avenue and Columbia Road, and in nearby Franklin Park. Local Jewish boys organized for self-defense: from fifty to one hundred Jewish participants could be rallied in short time to stave off attacks.

On the night of April 30, two young Harvard students walking along Elm Hill Avenue, in Roxbury, were approached by four youths. "Are you Jewish?" one of the four demanded. The two boys had no time to answer, or even to think; they were attacked and pummelled with heavy belts. One of the two had to be hospitalized.

On May 2, three Jewish boys were assaulted by a mob of thirty howling teen-agers in a Roxbury Metropolitan Transit Station, at 2:30 in the afternoon, while school traffic was at its height. One of the boys was beaten unconscious with a metal-studded belt. The assault was finally halted by the intervention of two men. One of the victims, an Irish Catholic youngster, later reported that the mob called him "kike," "sheeney," and "dirty Jew."

In the case of Boston, a community burdened with its share of slums, underprivileged citizens, lack of recreational facilities, war-time tension, and in some measure a residue of Christian Frontism, a pattern of racial and religious violence is prevalent. The frictions are kept alive by a preacher who nightly spreads the gospel of hate from Boston Common; by a pamphleteer who floods the city with racist literature; and by an annual celebration of Father Coughlin's birthday by a group of still-faithful followers.

The Anglo-Saxon Federation of America holds public monthly meetings in Boston. In addition to opening its publication to the propaganda of Robert H. Williams, Upton Close, and Gerald L. K. Smith, this well-organized group, led by Howard B. Rand, continues to attack American Jews for their support of the State of Israel.

Religious tensions have been increased by the activities of another organization, the American Fascist Union. In July 1950, the Union distributed in Boston subways hundreds of cheaply printed circulars which called for "the liberation of all our White Gentile Brothers from the Sadistic Communist Jew venom which has permeated the atmosphere of our once beautiful city." "Fascism is Inevitable!" the circular proclaimed, announcing the organization of "storm troopers here in Boston to check Jewish-Marxist brutality . . . and crush the power and force of this diabolical Jewish swindle." This was the work of Richard Hamel, of 7 Bulfinch Place, Boston, a twenty-six-year-old bus boy. In 1945 he led the one-man National Gentile League and attacked "international bankers," and the "Jew deal." (Hamel transferred his activities from the Boston area in December 1951, moving to Denver, where he quickly launched another of his campaigns.)

In 1951, Boston was also beset with the activities of Father Leonard Feeney of Cambridge, Massachusetts. Father Feeney

is a Roman Catholic priest who was formerly the director of St. Benedict's Center.

Two years earlier, Archbishop Cushing issued a decree that Father Feeney "because of grave offense against the general laws of the Catholic Church, has lost the right to perform any priestly functions, including preaching and teaching of religion." Six months later, Feeney was expelled from the Society of Jesus. (The dispute concerned Father Feeney's contention that there was no salvation outside the Catholic Church.)

Nonetheless, Father Feeney has built a personal following in Boston. His Sunday open meetings on Boston Common are attended by increasing audiences, who listen to his vituperation against his own Archbishop and against Protestants. "Shut up, you Jew!" he has shouted to a questioner. He has bitterly attacked Archbishop Cushing as a "pawn of the Jews and Protestants." He has assailed "you evil, filthy, adulterous Protestants." He has said, "You can fool some of the Protestants some of the time, but you can't fool a Jew," and "The Jews run the business end of Boston and the Protestants the religious end."

An experienced platform speaker, mixing sensationalism with piety, and marked by a Messianic zeal which inflames his audiences, Father Feeney adds fuel to the fires already burning in and about Boston.

Thus, the picture of racial and religious violence in Boston.

Indeed, the story of this small section of New England is one which could have developed in any American metropolis.

The impact of prejudice reflects itself in various ways from city to city. Closely allied to those who resort to physical assaults as an expression of prejudice are those who are guilty of desecrating places of worship, of sending anonymous hate letters, of writing vile messages on walls. It is difficult to tabulate the number of the latter—the offense is so common. But it was irony itself when, in September 1950, the walls of Independence

**Hall in Philadelphia—the national shrine to the fight for human rights—were defaced with anti-Semitic scrawlings and obscenity.**

**In Forest Hills, New York, vandals broke into the Bayside Cemetery and the adjoining Mokom Sholem Cemetery on February 17, 1951, kicked over the ancient grave markers, and trampled down the shrubbery.**

**In New York City, hoodlums threw rocks into the windows of a Jewish-owned lunchroom on March 15, 1951, shouting, “We’re going to kill the Jews,” and then ran down the street to throw rocks, cracking two windows in a Jewish synagogue at Ellwood and 196th streets.**

**In Cambridge, Massachusetts, hoodlums hurled pies against the front of the building of the Congregation Ashkenaz Synagogue in April 1951—the fourth such desecration of the synagogue in the last three years.**

**On the morning of May 24, 1951, students of Los Angeles City College discovered their campus sidewalks had been defaced by paint and acid. The single word “Jew” had been scrawled in three places, the Star of David in another. A similar incident took place months before on the campus of the University of Los Angeles.**

**In September 1950, swastikas were painted on the doors and windows of Sinair Temple, Los Angeles’s largest conservative synagogue, and on the doors of the Yiddish Culture Club.**

**In the first month of 1952, Philadelphia witnessed a number of anti-Semitic assaults on Jewish youth and acts of vandalism upon Jewish houses of worship. On January 18, the Synagogue B’nai Israel was twice stoned during the day; in the evening, while some sixty elderly people were congregated on the second floor, it was set afire. Two quart bottles filled with gasoline and ignited newspaper—the so-called Molotov Cocktail—were hurled through its windows. The week before, a group of anti-Semitic youths invaded the Benjamin F. Teller Memorial Syna-**

## 9 VIOLENT HARVEST

gogue, turned over all the pews, smashed ceiling lights, tore apart two precious seven-armed candelabra, ripped and scattered prayer books, and on their departure uprooted pine trees in front of the temple.

The cowardice, ghouliness, and irreverence inherent in cemetery desecrations are properly subjects for psychiatrists. In Wilkes-Barre, sixteen tombstones at the cemetery of the Anshei Emeth Congregation were desecrated. This type of ugly crime has been committed in many American cities in recent years.

There was no evident pattern to these attacks on synagogues and cemeteries in 1950-51. They took place in cities with many Jews and with few Jews; in Brooklyn, New York, and in Davenport, Iowa. Rarely were the culprits caught. They usually vanished as they had come, shrouded by the mist of ignorance and hate.

As the year 1951 came to an end, the violent harvest was frighteningly reaped in Miami, where there occurred a series of unexplained dynamitings of Jewish synagogues and community centers, a Negro housing project, and a Catholic church.

This nearly year-long episode began in the spring, when unknown vandals fired a bullet through a window of a temporary meeting place of the Tifereth Israel Northside Congregation. A month later, the restroom of a new community center which the congregants were building was dynamited. No one was hurt, but part of the structure was wrecked.

It became evident that this was no isolated incident, and that the two acts of violence were related. Jewish leaders in Hialeah, near Miami, disclosed that they had received telephone warnings from men threatening violence if a Jewish center was built as planned. Hialeah had been the recent scene of open Klan activity. The Jewish leaders abandoned the site.

Then came an apparently unrelated act of terror.



A housing project of 218 apartments had been erected on the edge of Miami's Negro district. The developers of the project found that there were many vacancies, and decided to rename a part of it, "Carver Village"—in honor of George Washington Carver, the distinguished Negro scientist—and to open it to Negroes, who, limited to a ghetto, suffered miserably from overcrowding.

A number of white citizens immediately threatened reprisals if the Negroes were permitted to move in. On the night of September 22, two charges of dynamite exploded against the wall of a vacant Carver Village building, causing damage reported at \$200,000. Ominous groups of men gathered about, and police had to throw a security cordon around the project.

Eight days later, Harold Robin, vice-president of the Tifereth Israel Congregation, was at home about 10 P.M. when he received a telephone call warning that the Center would be bombed in a few minutes.

When officials rushed to the scene, they found a three-foot cross stuck into the ground. On it was posted an anti-Semitic, anti-Negro piece of scurrility written in illiterate German, bearing Nazi swastikas and the initials K.K.K. It had such slogans as "*Heil Hitler und der K.K.K.*" and "*Deutschland uber Alles.*"

Robin told police that the voice over the telephone had a pronounced guttural accent.

Mrs. Robin then revealed that some days earlier two men, speaking with the same kind of accent, had called and asked for her husband, saying they would return when they could find him home. A week later, a man—again with an accent—called Robin and again warned of a bombing. But nothing happened. Police set up floodlights to illuminate the property.

A day later, congregants of Temple Israel, the largest and oldest reform synagogue in the area, found a crude cross painted red, and near by it the letters "K.K.K." Two sticks of dynamite were also found; they had been connected to a fuse that had

sputtered out before the spark reached the explosive; they were discovered by two little boys who picked them up.

A week later two sticks of dynamite were found at the Miami Hebrew School and Congregation. The culprits had apparently lighted the fuse and tossed the dynamite from an automobile. Again, the fuse proved faulty.

Early on Friday, November 30, Carver Village was again bombed. On Sunday, December 2, the dynamiters who had failed at the Miami Hebrew School and Congregation tried a second time—and succeeded. There was a sharp explosion—smashing forty-four memorial windows. A few moments later, a second explosion occurred—this time at Carver Village. It caused little damage.

The entire Miami area was up in arms. Community organizations met, spearheaded by meetings of Miami officials of the Anti-Defamation League, which had stepped into the picture at the beginning. Attorney General Howard McGrath in Washington, in response to A.D.L. requests, announced that he had ordered an FBI investigation. Police Chief Walter E. Headley offered large rewards in behalf of the City of Miami; community organizations and others added to it.

On December 9, in Coral Gables, Miami's sister city, the dynamiters struck again. First there was a telephone call to Safety Director William G. Kimbrough. "A man with a polite voice and thick accent," Kimbrough said later, told him: "We are going to blow the —— synagogue up!"

Special guards were set at the Coral Gables Jewish Center, but even then, a stick of dynamite, with a half-burned fuse, was found near the door. Obviously it had been hurled from a passing automobile, for fuse and dynamite were several feet apart.

On December 23, a stick of dynamite was planted in front of the St. Peter and St. Paul Catholic Church in Miami.

Such was the violence reaped in Greater Miami from racial

and religious bigotry. The *Miami Herald*, reflecting the attitude of all decent Americans, editorialized:

The dynamitings that have taken place are not a challenge to our Jewish population alone . . .

Nor to our Negro residents.

Nor to any group which may become the target of, or fear, the law-breaking terrorists, whose devious and desperate real purpose probably will not become known until they are captured.

The challenge is to the peace and well-being of the whole community and must be met by the united community, not by a segment selected on any religious, racial, or other limited basis.

On Christmas night 1951, the family of Harry T. Moore, a forty-six-year-old schoolteacher and civic leader, slept peacefully in their modest, one-story home in Mims, Florida, a tiny rural community some forty miles south of popular Daytona Beach.

It was an exciting and happy Christmas week for them—for Mr. Moore, his wife Harriet, aged forty-nine, their daughter Anne, and Mr. Moore's seventy-one-year-old mother, a schoolteacher, who had come to visit them earlier in the week.

First, there had been a wonderful surprise—the sudden appearance a few days before of Moore's nephew, Master Sergeant George Sims, home from Korea to spend Christmas leave with his family. In addition, Moore's other daughter, Evangeline, who taught school in the northern part of the state, was to arrive the day after Christmas. Not only would the entire family be together, but they would be together to celebrate a festive occasion—the twenty-fifth wedding anniversary of Harry and Harriet Moore.

As a family, the Moores were held in high esteem. Moore had always been a hard-working, civic-minded man. He was general manager of the Florida Progressive Voters League, and well known because of the speaking tours he made throughout the state, urging everyone to come out and exercise his or her

franchise, to vote, to make democracy truly reflective of the people. For a number of years he had been a high school principal. The son of poor parents, he had been able through his own labors to put himself, his wife, and both daughters through school at the Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach. Like him, they had majored in education. It would have been difficult to find any other family for miles around in which three generations—mother, son and daughter-in-law, and both grandchildren—were all schoolteachers.

The house was quiet, the Christmas tree in the parlor bathed in the soft light of its tiny, gaily colored bulbs, the Christmas presents beneath it still unopened—waiting the arrival of Evangeline, when the Moores would celebrate Christmas, reunion, and anniversary, all in one.

Mrs. Moore's aged mother turned restlessly and then awoke as she lay in bed in a small room leading off the main bedroom in which the Moores slept. Not far away was Anne's small bedroom.

It was 10:30 P.M. Suddenly, as Mrs. Moore's mother lay there awake, the light fixture from the ceiling trembled and dropped. Then there was an all-encompassing, deafening roar.

Somehow she found herself on her feet and running, screaming, into the room where her granddaughter had been asleep. The girl lay on the bed—dazed, but unhurt.

Together the two women rushed into the Moores' bedroom. The room was completely wrecked. The bed was a mass of rubble. As they stood transfixed with horror and helplessness, Sergeant Sims, who had been awakened by the blast, rushed in. Carefully he pushed aside the rubble over the bed to uncover the broken, bleeding body of Moore; and near by, the half-conscious form of Mrs. Moore. She had been blown into a wedge-shaped space formed by the twisted frame of the bed and what remained of a bookcase.

A person, or persons, unknown, had placed a charge of dyna-

mite under the house directly beneath the Moores' bed. So the police were to find later, and of this civic authorities were to speak in the days to come.

Mr. and Mrs. Moore were rushed to a hospital thirty miles distant. Moore died shortly after he was admitted. He had suffered a brain concussion and internal injuries. His wife was also fatally injured; she followed him in death a few days later.

Harry T. Moore was a Negro. The Moores were a Negro family. In addition, Harry Moore was an official of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. His life had been devoted to the struggle for equality for all citizens regardless of race, religion, and color.

And in his case, the seed sown in prejudice and reaped in violence in terror-stricken Florida this Christmas season of 1951 produced the most evil harvest of all—murder.



## A FINAL WORD

Our story ends on a note of violence because violence is the ultimate product of the troublemakers. To those concerned with the health of our society let it not be a note of despair, but one of challenge and hope. For the perpetrators of these acts of violence have gained no mass of adherents.

The pattern of violence that has been spreading in the South and pushing its way into the North is a reflection of desperation on the part of the troublemakers. They wish to throw up road-blocks of intimidation with dynamite, as in other years they resorted to lynchings, cross-burnings, floggings, and mob riots.

This device, too, shall fail and for many reasons: the soundness and strength of our democratic society; the dramatic ferment that is stirring our country into mighty efforts to eradicate the curse of prejudice; the recognition by millions of our citizens that group tensions are a menace to the life of our country and the well-being of our communities.

Never in all the history of our land has there been such widespread recognition of the peril of uncontrolled prejudice, bigotry,

#### A FINAL WORD

and group tensions; and never have so many people and organized groups taken so active a part in coping with these problems from the national right down to the grass-roots level. Despite the last-ditch fight of troublemakers against progress, the democratic frontiers are being pushed forward in our country.

The troublemakers, spinning on their wheel of hate along the network of bigots that reaches from coast to coast, can be isolated and defeated. Only when the troublemakers succeed in enmeshing large numbers of decent citizens in their prejudices do their actions become a menace to the peaceful balances of American life. But the people have natural defenses against such involvements, and these must be constantly sharpened and kept in use.

The major defenses are those traditional American virtues, presented forcefully to our school children for generations but frequently scoffed at by cynics: a sense of decency and fair play; an enlightened self-interest; a sense of patriotism and good citizenship. Translated into meaningful action on every level of life today, they can form an impenetrable barrier against the bigots.

A sense of decency and fair play will stop the smearing of the innocent. It will repudiate the hate-mongering of the troublemaker. It will rise up against flagrant violations of justice. It will trouble our conscience when we remain passive in the face of disabilities suffered by so many Americans because of race or creed or national origin. It will rouse our sleeping sense of outrage and catapult us into action when action is needed.

An enlightened national self-interest will remind us that Lincoln's admonition—that this nation cannot survive half slave and half free—is as true today as it was in the middle of the nineteenth century. It will make us aware that no single group can long retain privileges which are denied to others—such



basic privileges as the right of all citizens to decent housing, to equal educational opportunities, to employment without discrimination, to equal access to places of public accommodation, to vote freely and according to one's conscience, and, most important, to safety and security of person. It will awaken us to the fact that we weaken our nation in wasting skills and human resources by the practice of racial and religious discrimination. It will jolt us into action with the realization that only as a nation united, with an undiminished man power, can we defend ourselves from our enemies abroad.

A sense of patriotism and good citizenship will translate our democratic *ideology* into democratic *realization*. Good citizenship implies vigorous efforts to eradicate discrimination, to educate our children in the ways of democratic life, to re-educate our people away from ingrained patterns of prejudice. And as Benjamin Franklin well said, this is not a matter for a single day. It must necessarily be a continuing and constant effort.

Wanting it with all our hearts, our intelligence can create a free and full life for all people.

#### **A FINAL WORD**

**CREDITS** The Civil Rights Committee of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith wishes to record its sincere tribute to its staff, without whose talents and devoted services the Committee's task could not have been completed. The persons who participated, in addition to those acknowledged previously, are:

**HEADQUARTERS STAFF** Helene E. Auerbach, Eleanor Belack, Anne Cannon, Samuel D. Friefeld, Nissen N. Gross, Paul Hartmann, Mortimer Kass, Frank Mankiewicz, John Merlander, William G. Pinsley, Arnold Scheuer, Bernard Simon, Hilda Weinstein, Isadore Zack

#### **REGIONAL DIRECTORS**

Gilbert J. Balkin, Florida  
Brant Coopersmith, New Orleans  
Ben-Zion Emanuel, Illinois Regional  
Blanche B. Eisenstein, BB-ADL office, Philadelphia  
Herman Edelsberg, Washington, D.C.  
Michael Freed, Mountain States  
Theodore Freedman, North Carolina-Virginia  
S. Thomas Friedman, Southwestern Regional Jewish CRC  
Seymour Gorchoff, Ohio-Kentucky  
Oscar Groner, New Jersey  
Fred Grossman, Pennsylvania  
Hyman H. Haves, Connecticut  
Stanley S. Jacobs, Northern California  
Seymour H. Kaplan, Plains States  
Thelma Keitlen, Western Massachusetts  
Sol Kolack, New England  
Haskell L. Lazere, Michigan  
Sidney Lawrence, Community Council of Greater Kansas City  
Arthur J. Levin, Atlanta  
Alexander F. Miller, Southern Regional  
Israel H. Moss, Western New York  
David Robinson, Western Regional  
A. Abbot Rosen, Midwest Regional  
P. Allen Rickles, Washington State  
Sidney H. Sayles, Wisconsin  
Milton A. Semm, Pacific-Southwest  
Lester J. Waldman, Metropolitan New York

## **ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH**

**CHAIRMAN** Hon. Meier Steinbrink

**HONORARY VICE-CHAIRMEN** Barney Balaban, A. G. Ballenger, Phillip W. Haberman, A. C. Horn, Hon. Herbert H. Lehman

**EXECUTIVE VICE-CHAIRMAN** Richard E. Gutstadt

**VICE-CHAIRMEN** Maurice N. Dannenbaum, Philip M. Klutznick, Edmund Waterman

**TREASURER** Jacob Alson

**NATIONAL DIRECTOR** Benjamin R. Epstein

**COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN—EX-OFFICIO** Benjamin Greenberg, Finance; Hon. Jacob Grumet, Civil Rights; Melvin H. Schlesinger, Community Service; Samuel H. Nerlove, Program

### **NATIONAL COMMISSION**

Leonard Abess, Miami, Fla.  
Jacob Alson, New York, N.Y.  
I. B. Benjamin, Los Angeles, Cal.  
Mrs. Joseph S. Berenson, New York, N.Y.  
Maurice Bisgyer, Washington, D.C.  
William P. Bloom, Tuscaloosa, Ala.  
Joseph Cohen, Kansas City, Kan.  
Maurice N. Dannenbaum, Houston, Tex.  
Aaron Droock, Detroit, Mich.  
Henry Epstein, New York, N.Y.  
Frank Garson, Atlanta, Ga.  
William M. Gerber, Philadelphia, Pa.  
Dr. Maurice A. Goldberg, Washington, D.C.  
Edward Goldberger, New York, N.Y.  
Frank Goldman, Lowell, Mass.  
Frank R. S. Kaplan, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
Philip Klutznick, Park Forest, Ill.  
Harold Lachman, Chicago, Ill.

Ralph Lazarus, Columbus, O.  
Herbert Levy, Chicago, Ill.  
David H. Litter, New York, N.Y.  
Bernard Nath, Chicago, Ill.  
Jefferson E. Peyser, San Francisco, Cal.  
Hon. David A. Rose, Boston, Mass.  
Mrs. Benjamin Rosenthal, Los Angeles, Cal.  
Paul Sampliner, New York, N.Y.  
Benjamin Samuels, Chicago, Ill.  
Max J. Schneider, New York, N.Y.  
Henry Schultz, New York, N.Y.  
Hon. Meier Steinbrink, New York, N.Y.  
Jesse Steinhart, San Francisco, Cal.  
John J. Untermann, Newark, N.J.  
Edmund Waterman, New York, N.Y.  
Mrs. Albert Woldman, Cleveland, O.  
Louis Zara, New York, N.Y.

**NATIONAL STAFF DIRECTORS** Oscar Cohen, Community Service; Arnold Forster, Civil Rights; J. Harold Saks, Administration; Lester J. Waldman, Program



## INDEX

- A**  
 Abraham Lincoln Brigade, 50  
 Abshier, Edward, 244  
 Abt, John, 44  
 Acheson, Dean, 22, 97, 106, 171, 181, 184  
*A.D.L. and Its Use in the World Communist Offensive, The*, 156, 206  
 A.F.L., 214  
*Akron Beacon Journal*, 243  
*Al Misri*, 175, 206  
 Aldali, M. Wahid, 172  
*Alien Minorities and Mongrelization*, 104n.  
 Allen, Marilyn R., 104, 108, 134, 161, 207, 246-47  
 Alsop, Joseph, 61  
 Alsop, Stewart, 61  
*America in Danger*, 100  
 American Anti-Communist League, 56, 246  
 American Association for Social Workers, 62  
 American Civil Liberties Union, 280  
 American Council for Judaism, 96  
 American Council of Christian Churches, 108  
 American Egyptian Society, 191, 193-94  
 American Fascist Union, 291  
 American Flag Committee, 104  
 American Jewish Committee, 92, 103, 230n.  
 American Jewish Congress, 211, 230n.  
*American Klansman*, 161  
 American Legion, 92, 199, 206  
*American Order, The*, 110  
 American Order of '76, 142n.  
 American Party, 110  
 American Protective Association, 110, 112  
 American Protestant League, 127, 133, 138  
*American Race Problem, The*, 63  
 Americans for Democratic Action, 214, 228  
*America's Castle of Freedom*, 156  
 Anglo-Israel Bible Class, 53n.  
 Anglo-Saxon Christian Congregation, 27, 88, 204, 247  
 Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, 203, 291  
 Anti-Catholicism. *See* Catholics, persecution of  
 Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 42, 82, 84, 89, 91, 117-18, 155-56, 211, 230-31, 250, 264, 283, 286-87, 296, 303-5; *Bulletin*, 147  
 Anti-Semitism. *See* Jews, persecution of  
 Arab Higher Committee of Palestine, 172, 183-84

# INDEX

Arab League, 169-96, 202  
 Arab News Agency, 175  
 Arab Office (Washington, D.C.), 97, 171  
 Armstrong, George W., 21, 88, 108, 156, 158-62, 199, 204, 207  
 Arnold, Benedict, 83, 89  
 Aryan, C. Leon de, 100, 203, 250  
 Asher, Court, 134  
 Association of Jewish Chaplains of the Armed Forces, 230n.  
 Association of Republican Clubs, 142n.  
 Atkinson, Rev. Dr. Henry A., 102  
 Atlanta *Constitution*, 64-65, 71, 161  
 Aubert, Theodore, 204  
 Audley, Rose Schoendorf. *See* Freedman, Mrs. Benjamin H.  
 Azzam Pasha, Abdul Rahman, 171-74, 176, 178-96, 202, 206

## B

Babb, Sheriff, 280  
 Baker, Newton, 90  
 Bandak, Yusif el, 172, 174, 183-84  
 Bang, Mrs. Charles, 192  
 Banta, Edwin, 145  
 Bareis, Edward F., 155  
 Barkley, Alben W., 263  
 Barnes, John P., 279  
 Baruch, Bernard M., 59, 84, 102, 252  
 Beard, Dr. Charles A., 148n.  
 Beauharnais, Alexandre, 154  
 Beauharnais, Joseph, 150-58, 161, 165, 261, 282  
*Behind the Lace Curtain of the Y.W.C.A.*, 208  
 Belmont, August P., 83  
 Benjamin, Juda[h] P., 83  
*Benjamin Franklin's Jewish Prophecy*, 148  
 Bennett, Wallace F., 246  
 Benton, Elmer, 121  
 Berentschot, Rev. John M., 129-31  
 Best, Frank Ellison, 162-65  
 Best Foundation, Inc., 164  
 Best Universal Lock Co., 162, 164  
 Bird, Mrs. Anita, 121, 123, 125n.  
 Bird, Vigo, 123

308

Black, Parnell, 247  
 B'nai B'rith, 83-84, 91, 147, 156, 230n. *See also* Anti-Defamation League  
 Bob Jones University, 183  
 Book-of-the-Month Club, 63  
 Boston *Herald*, 288-89  
 Boston Jewish Community Council, 86-88  
 Boston riots (1950-51), 284-92  
 Boston *Traveler*, 288  
 Bouhafa, Abed, 175, 182, 206  
 Bowles, Norman Springfellow, 143-44  
*Broom, The*, 100, 203  
 Broughton, J. Melville, 238-39  
 Brown, Earl, 224  
 Brown, John, 83  
 Buchanan Committee, 199-200  
 Buddies Club, 142-43  
 Bushel, Hyman, 102-3  
 Byrd, Senator Harry F., 55, 59  
 Byrnes, James F., 59

## C

Caffery, Jefferson, 189-90  
 Cain, Senator Harry P., 44-45, 59  
 Calderon, Enrique, 234-36  
 Calvin, Dorothea E., 261  
 Camelback Inn, Phoenix, Ariz., 266  
 Cammack Center, Huntington, W. Va., 80  
 Carroll, John E., 248  
 Carver Village, Miami, 295-96  
 Catholic Interracial Council, 156  
 Catholics, persecution of, 75-76, 108-48, *passim*  
*Challenge to the Republicans in 1950*, 246  
 Chambers, Whittaker, 51  
 Chappell, Mrs. Loretto, 61-73  
 Cherrington, Ben, 192-93  
 Chicago *American*, 119  
 Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination, 279, 283  
 Chicago Housing Authority, 270  
 Chicago *Tribune*, 95, 119-21, 124  
 Child Welfare Library, Atlanta, 62-63  
 Childs, Marquis, 61

- Chinese: immigration of, 77; segregation of, 268-69
- Christian Front, 78, 291
- Christian Nationalist Crusade, 57-58, 86-88, 108, 168
- Christian Nationalist Party, 165, 244-45
- Christian Science Monitor*, 211
- Church Federation of Greater Chicago, 279
- Cicero (Ill.) riots, 151n., 158, 277-84
- Cinema Educational Guild, 203, 205
- C.I.O., 214, 222, 225
- Citizens Protective Association, 144, 165-68; *Bulletin*, 167
- Civil Liberties Union (Chicago), 156
- Civil Rights Congress, 220-21
- Clark, Harvey E., Jr., 151n., 278-84
- Clark, Mrs. Johnetta, 278
- Clay, Gen. Lucius, 158
- Clemenceau, Georges, 90
- Cleveland Council on World Affairs, 192
- Cloisters, Sea Island, Ga., 263
- Close, Upton, 21, 28, 134, 198-201, 206-8, 213, 215-16, 250, 291
- Closer-Ups*, 198
- Collins, Gen. J. Lawton, 182
- Collins, Mary, 272
- Colorado Anti-Communist League, 248
- Colter, M. W., 262
- Columbus *Citizen*, 243
- Commings, Mrs. Marguerite, 148
- Commission to Investigate Communism and All Other Un-American Activities, 142n.
- Committee for Constitutional Government, 199, 215
- Committee for Nation-wide Day of Prayer, 142n.
- Common Sense*, 28, 41, 43-44, 58, 90, 92, 105, 203-4, 215
- Commonweal*, *The*, 259
- Communist Party, 217-32, *passim*
- Community Fund (Chicago), 152
- Congressional Record*, 100, 129, 131, 250-51
- Constitutional Educational League, 207, 215.
- Convent Life Unveiled*, 138
- Co-operative Society of America, 120
- Coplon, Judith, 44
- Coughlin, Rev. Charles, 78, 207, 291
- Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination, 156
- Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 212
- Counterattack*, 41, 50
- Creighton University, 274
- Cross and the Flag, The*, 108, 201-2, 206-8, 244
- Cushing, Archbishop, 292
- Cutler, John W., 251-52
- D
- D.A.R., 62, 106
- Davis, Benjamin J., 224
- Davis, Corneal A., 154
- Davis, Jefferson, 83
- Dayton *Independent*, 148
- Dearborn *Independent*, 77, 81n., 84-85
- Deatherage, George, 78, 142, 199, 204, 207
- Defender, The*, 100
- Delray Beach, Fla., 261-62
- Dennis, Eugene, 218, 227
- Dennis, J. A., 112
- Dennis, Lawrence, 134, 208
- Denver, University of, Social Science Foundation, 192
- De Sola, Ralph, 30-39, 41-42, 45-52, 54-57, 59
- De Sola, Mrs. Ralph, 30, 36, 45, 49, 55-56
- Destiny*, 203
- Deutsch, Albert, 63
- Deutsch, Morton, 272
- Dewey, Thomas E., 68, 82, 148, 282
- Diario de Nueva York, El*, 236
- Dies, Martin, 88
- Dies Committee, 27, 29, 38-39, 43, 52-53, 142, 161, 239
- Dilling, Mrs. Elizabeth, 84, 133-34, 144, 200, 208, 215, 250

# INDEX

Displaced Persons Act, 250-51  
 Displaced Persons Commission, 251-52  
 Dixiecrats, 161  
 Donner, Robert, 199, 203, 207-8  
 Dresser, Robert B., 215  
 Dulles, John Foster, 22, 82  
 Dunne, Rev. George H., 259  
 Dusseldorf, O. van, 64

## E

Edmondson, Robert Edward, 134, 144  
 Education, Federal aid to, 22, 212-13  
*Educational Guardian*, 212, 216  
 Edwards, Charles S., 278-79  
 Edwards, Frank, 246-47  
*Egypt*, 190, 194  
 Egyptian Hockey Association, 177  
 Egyptian Information Bureau, 190, 194  
 Egyptian Town Hall Mission, 190-94  
 Einstein, Albert, 82  
 Eisenhower, Dwight D., 59, 148  
 Elmhurst, Ernest, 97  
 Evans, Hiram, 111  
*Exposure of Hate Groups*, 206

## F

Fagan, Myron C., 199, 203-7  
 Fairgrounds Park (St. Louis) riot, 166  
 Farouk I, 177  
 Fattah, Soliman Abdul, 188  
 FBI, 30, 36, 38-41, 45, 50, 53, 56, 59, 61, 144, 283-84, 296  
 Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 253  
 Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 133-34, 137  
 Feeney, Rev. Leonard, 291-92  
 FEPC, 21, 61-63, 65, 67-68, 134, 154, 211-12, 234, 238-41, 249  
*FEPC and the Minority Machine*, 206, 211  
 Ferguson, Joseph, 243  
*Fiery Cross*, 209  
 Fifield, Rev. James W., Jr., 174  
*Fifth Column in the South, The*, 209

First Baptist Church and Tabernacle (Englewood, Colo.), 126, 134  
 Fish, Hamilton, 88  
 Florida Progressive Voters League, 297  
 Foley, Frank D., 72-73  
 Ford, Henry, 81n., 83-84, 88  
*Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States*, 109  
 Forrestal, James V., 82  
 Forster, Arnold, 82, 91, 149n.  
 Fort Lauderdale, Fla., 262  
 Fort Worth *Star Telegram*, 161  
 Frank, Leo, 77  
 Frankfurter, Felix, 22, 28n., 83-84, 88, 106, 184  
 Franklin, Benjamin, 303  
 Franklin Institute (Philadelphia), 148n.  
 Freedman, Benjamin H., 29-31, 33-35, 40-49, 51-60, 80, 85-86, 90-103, 199, 202-4  
 Freedman, Mrs. Benjamin H., 93, 95  
 Freedman, Hannah Kafferman, 93  
 Freedman, Moritz, 93  
*Freeman*, 33  
 Friends of Democracy, 209  
 Fuad University, 177

## G

Gallup Poll, 121  
 Galusha, Mark, 54-55, 59  
 Gelatt, Harry, 261-62  
 Genocide Convention, 22, 209-10  
 Georgia State Department of Welfare, Children's Division, 61-71  
 German-American Bund, 33, 134, 140, 142  
 German-American Republican League, 144  
 Ghour, Emil, 172  
 Gibbons, James Cardinal, 111  
 Gittelsohn, 241  
 Goff, Kenneth, 134, 248  
 Compers, Samuel, 83  
 Gossett, Ed, 54, 99-100, 202, 250  
 Graham, Dr. Frank, 238-40  
 Green, William, 82



Green Shirts (Egypt), 97  
Gurney, Senator J. Chandler, 35, 48-49

## H

Haas, Rev. Francis J., 241  
Hamel, Richard, 291  
Hamilton, John W., 162, 165-68, 244-45  
Hansen, Carl, 264  
Harriman, W. Averell, 181  
Harris, William, 40-41, 50  
Hart, Luke E., 129, 131-32  
Hart, Merwin K., 21, 84, 99, 102, 105, 108, 198-204, 207, 211, 213-16  
Hart, Mrs. Merwin K., 201-2  
Hauptmann, Bruno, 143  
Hawthorne Inn, Mount Pocono, Pa., 265  
Hazam, John, 180  
Headley, Walter E., 296  
Hearst, William Randolph, 119  
Hecht House, Dorchester, Mass., 285-87  
Heggie, Richard, 193  
Hendrix, Bill, 91, 203  
Henry, Lawrence, 248  
Hillman, Sidney, 83, 135  
Hiss, Alger, 44, 51, 106  
Hitler, 84, 94, 97, 101, 117, 140, 147, 172, 195  
*Hitler Was a Liberal*, 209  
Hoffman, Clare E., 56, 60, 250  
Holy Land Emergency Liaison Program, 180  
Holy Name Society, 92  
Homestead, Hot Springs, Va., 266  
House Committee on Un-American Affairs. *See* Dies Committee  
Housing segregation, 255-76  
*How Red Is John Carroll?*, 248  
*How We Blundered into Korean War and Tragic Future Consequences*, 215  
Hudson, Charles B., 100, 134  
Human Relations Commission (Chicago), 155-56  
Hunt, Senator Lester C., 49, 59

Huntington *Herald-Advertiser*, 85  
Hussein, Ahmed, 97-99  
Husseini, Haj Amin el, 98, 172  
Husseini, Rajah el, 172, 180, 183-84  
Hutchins, Robert M., 59

## I

*I Led Three Lives*, 61  
*I Was a Priest*, 133  
Igoe, Michael L., 125  
Illinois Interracial Commission, 279  
Independent Bible Baptist Mission, 127  
Institute of Arab-American Affairs, 171, 176, 180  
Intagliata, Joe (Morello), 244  
International Council of Christian Churches, 108  
International Fur & Leather Workers Union, 225  
*International Jew, The*, 81, 83  
International Labor Defense, 222  
International Workers Order, 225  
*Is There a Purgatory?*, 138  
Israel, 79, 85, 94-97, 169-96. *See also* Palestine  
*It Isn't Safe to Be an American*, 156

## J

Jamali, Dr. Fadel, 180  
Jefferson, Thomas, 89-90  
Jefferson Military College (Miss.), 160  
Jehovah's Witnesses, 134  
Jenkins, Mrs. Jessie Welch, 207, 209  
Jenkins, Ray, 237  
Jernigan, Alva, 244  
Jewish Labor Committee, 230n.  
Jewish War Veterans of the United States, 229-30  
Jews, persecution of, 25-108, 169-96, 284-96, *passim*  
John Reed Clubs, 27-32, 34-35, 38, 41, 43-45, 49-50, 53  
Johnson, Lyndon, 33  
Josephine de Beauharnais, 154  
Judge Armstrong Foundation, 159-60

# INDEX

*Judgment of the Great Whore, The*, 138

## K

KALL, 247  
 Kamp, Joseph P., 104-5, 108, 156, 199-200, 204-16, 250  
 Kantor, Samuel, 235-36  
 Kaplan, Sumner L., 255-56  
 Katibah, Habib I., 95, 97, 182  
 Kaufman, Irving, 227  
 Kefauver, Senator Estes, 33, 42-44, 106  
 Kemper, Alan, 62-63, 71  
 Keshinian, Levon, 174-75, 182  
 Khouri, Faris bey el, 187  
 Kimbrough, William G., 296  
 Kirkpatrick, Ted, 41, 50  
 Knights of Columbus, 129-32, 141  
 Knights of Columbus "oath," 128-32  
 Knights of the White Camelia, 142  
 Know-Nothings, 110, 112  
*Know the Truth*, 58, 101  
*Know Your Enemy*, 206  
 Knowland, Senator William F., 48, 54  
 Knoxville *News-Sentinel*, 236-37  
 Konovsky, Erwin, 283  
 Korachi, Issi, 176  
 Kramer, Charles, 44  
 Krock, Arthur, 210  
 Ku Klux Klan, 27, 77, 91n., 111-12, 140, 149-50, 161, 203, 207, 209, 241, 247, 249, 277  
 Kuhn, Fritz, 142

## L

Labor unions, 213-14  
 Ladies' Auxiliary of the Protestant Veterans, 142n.  
 LaGuardia, Fiorello, 143  
 LaGuardia, Mrs. Fiorello, 59  
 Lanier, Mrs., 70  
 Lasell, Harold, 107  
 Lasell, Helen P., 103-8, 161  
 Laski, Harold, 82, 85

League for Peace with Justice in Palestine, 94-96, 100  
 League for Political Education, 213-14  
 Lee, J. Bracken, 246-47  
 Lehman, Herbert H., 84, 88, 102  
 Leimert Park, Calif., 258-59  
 Lerner, Max, 85  
 Leva, Marx, 28n.  
 Lewis, Fulton, Jr., 27, 29, 40, 51-52, 56-58, 106  
 Liberal Party (New York), 228  
*Liberty Bell*, 114-18, 125  
 Lincoln, Abraham, 81, 110, 302  
 Lindbergh, Charles, 78, 88, 143  
 Lippmann, Walter, 90  
 "List of Heresies and Human Inventions Adopted by and Perpetuated by the Roman Catholic Church, A," 138  
 Lloyd, William, 248  
 Lloyd George, David, 81  
 Loeb, William, 241-42  
 Lohbeck, Don, 244  
 Long, Huey, 87  
 Lowande, Alexander A., 145  
 Loyal Legion & Commandery of the Protestant War Veterans of the U.S., 142n.  
 Lutheran Research Society (Detroit), 207n.  
 Lyon, Cal, 243

## M

MacArthur, Gen. Douglas, 79, 82  
 Mackay, James, 65, 67-68  
 Malik, Charles, 187  
 Malik, Jacob, 186, 189  
*Man Called White*, A, 222  
 Manchester *Morning Union*, 241-42  
 Mandel, Ben, 52  
 Marin County, Calif., 271  
 Marine Terrace Hotel, Miami Beach, 262  
 Markoe, Rev. John, 274  
 Marshall, George C., 25, 27, 52, 106, 171, 181, 187  
 Marshall Plan, 79

Martha Washington Hotel, Virginia Beach, 266  
 Marx, Karl, 214, 245  
 Matthews, Dr. Joseph B., 27, 29-30, 40-41, 45, 50, 52-54  
 McAllister, Andrew, 207  
 McCarran, Senator Patrick A., 250-52  
 McCarthy, Senator Joseph R., 35, 40, 48, 51-52, 54-57, 71  
 McCormick, Robert R., 124  
 McCrary, Tex, 59  
 McGee, Willie, 218-20, 225  
 McGhee, George, 181  
 McGill, Ralph, 161  
 McGinley, Conde, 43-44, 58, 80, 104-5, 108, 161, 199, 203-4  
 McGrath, J. Howard, 116, 124, 296  
 McGraw, James, 31-32, 41, 49-50, 59  
 McIntire, Carl, 108  
 McKinley, William, 81, 111  
 McWilliams, Joe, 33, 42, 97  
*Measure of Freedom, A*, 149n.  
 Medina, Harold R., 221n.  
*Mein Kampf*, 84  
*Menace, The*, 110  
 Mertig, Kurt, 97, 144  
 Miami *Herald*, 297  
 Miami riots (1951), 294-97  
 Mid-Century World Outlook Conference, 183  
 Milliken, Senator Eugene D., 248  
 Mims, Fla., 297-99  
 Mims, J. Bush, 62-72  
 Mims Committee, 62-72  
 Minute Women of the United States, 215  
 Monomonock Inn, Mountainhome, Pa., 266  
 Moore, Anne, 297-99  
 Moore, Evangeline, 297  
 Moore, Harry T., 297-99  
 Moore, Mrs. Harry T., 297-99  
 Morgan, J. P., 82  
 Morgan, Woodrow, 274-75  
 Morgenthau, Henry, 84-85, 88  
 Morse, Samuel F. B., 109  
 Moseley, George Van Horn, 86, 161, 204, 207  
 Moslem Brotherhood, 176

Muslimin, Ikwhan el, 176  
 Mussolini, 117

# N

Napoleon, 90, 154  
 Nashville *Tennesseean*, 135  
 National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 221-22, 240, 259, 299  
 National Catholic Welfare Conference, 113  
 National Committee Against Communism, 142-43  
 National Community Relations Advisory Council, 230  
 National Council for American Education, 104, 213, 216  
 National Council for Civil Liberties, 142n.  
 National Council of Jewish Women, 230n.  
 National Democratic Bureau, 142-43  
 National Democratic Publicity Bureau, 142-43  
 National Economic Council, 199, 215-16; *Letter*, 84, 102, 105, 108, 202, 204, 214-15  
 National Gentile League, 291  
 National Hoover-for-President League, 142-43  
 National Press Club (Washington, D.C.), 189  
 Native Americans, 109  
 Nazism, 78, 94, 140  
 Needham (Mass.) housing project, 255-57  
 Negro Urban League, 152  
 Negroes, persecution of, 75-76, 134, 148-68, 277-84, 296-99, *passim*  
 Nellor, Edward K., 34, 48, 50-52, 56-59  
 New Deal, 31, 85, 134, 234  
*New Russia's Primer, The*, 63  
 New York *Daily Worker*, 227  
 New York *Herald Tribune*, 97; Paris edition, 94  
 New York *Observer*, 109  
 New York Protestant Council, 142

# INDEX

New York *Times*, 27n., 210, 249  
 New York University's Research Center of Human Relations, 272  
 Niles, David K., 102  
 Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, 102  
 North Carolina, University of, 238  
 North Point Club, Raquette Lake, N.Y., 265  
 NRA, 45  
 Nye, Gerald P., 78

## O

O'Gorman, Edith, 138  
*Olcott's Blue Book*, 270  
 Omaha, Neb., 274-75  
*Open Letters* (Sammons), 80, 82, 88, 203  
*Open Letters to the American People* (Smythe), 146  
*Operation Survival*, 205  
*Our Common Cause*, 142n.  
*Our Constitution*, 156, 161  
*Our Rejected Children*, 63

## P

P.A.C., 214  
 Palestine: Anglo-American Committee on, 94, 97; British White Paper, 96.  
*See also* Israel  
 Paradise Inn, Phoenix, Ariz., 265  
 Parker, Harrison, 114-26, 139  
 Parker, Mrs. Harrison, 119-21, 123, 125n.  
 Parker, Thomas, 114, 126  
 Patriotic Tract Society, 167  
 Patterson, Robert P., 59  
 Pearson, Drew, 56, 61, 88  
 Pelley, William Dudley, 78, 142, 144, 148n.  
 Philbrick, Herbert A., 61  
 Piedmont College (Ga.), 161  
 Pinckney, Charles, 148n.  
 Pines, Cotuit, Mass., 265  
*Political Affairs*, 227  
 Populist Party, 111  
 Powell, Wesley, 241-42

*Prensa, La* (New York), 235  
 President's Committee on Civil Rights, 239  
 Pressman, Lee, 44  
 Pro-American Information Bureau (Hinckley, Ill.), 207n.  
 Proskauer, Joseph M., 103  
 Protestant Chaplains Association, 142n., 144-45  
 Protestant Church Boys' Brigade of the U.S., 142n.  
 Protestant Civil Welfare Federation, 142n.  
 "Protestant Embassy," 114, 116-18, 126  
 Protestant Fife & Drum Corps of the U.S., 142n.  
 Protestant Gold Star Mothers, 142n.  
 Protestant Information Bureau, 127, 133  
 Protestant Loyal Legion of the U.S., 142n.  
 Protestant News Service, 142n.  
 Protestant Service Men's Club, 142n., 145  
 "Protestant Statesman & Nation," 141  
 Protestant War Veterans of the U.S., Inc., 142-43, 145  
*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, 78, 80-81, 129, 159, 201  
 "Puritan Church," 114-15, 118, 120-26

## R

Rahim, Kamil Abdul, 191, 194  
*Raleigh News & Observer*, 239-40  
 Rand, Howard B., 203, 291  
 Rankin, John, 49, 53-55, 60, 90, 249-50  
 Rankin Bill, 91  
*Recruiting Through Struggle*, 226  
*Red Network, The*, 84  
*Red Wine First*, 62, 66-67  
 Redmond, Sidney, 244  
 Reed, Douglas, 202, 204  
 Reid, John B., 262  
 Reilly, Lawrence, 207-8  
 Restrictive covenants, 255-76

**Reuter, 63**  
**Reynolds, Robert R., 78**  
***Reynolds News*, 220**  
**Rhodes scholars, 107**  
**Richards, C. "Jack," 237**  
**Richardson, Hallam, 33, 40, 42-43,**  
     **54, 97, 102-3**  
**Richardson, Mrs., 121**  
**Riesel, Victor, 59**  
**Ring, William C., 205**  
**Roberts, Dr. Hines, 68-70**  
**Robeson, Paul, 247**  
**Robin, Harold, 295**  
**Robinson, David, 231**  
**Rocky Mountain Evangelist Associa-**  
     **tion, 127**  
**Rogers, Rev. Warren A., 163**  
**Roosevelt, Archibald, 180**  
**Roosevelt, Eleanor, 105**  
**Roosevelt, Franklin D., 82, 85, 106,**  
     **143, 158n., 233**  
**Roosevelt, Franklin D., Jr., 83**  
**Roosevelt, Theodore, Jr., 180**  
**Rosenberg, Anna, 50**  
**Rosenberg, Mrs. Anna M., 25-61, 72,**  
     **75, 79, 92, 99, 106, 148, 186-87,**  
     **202, 250**  
**Rosenberg, Ethel, 226**  
**Rosenberg, Julius, 226**  
**Rosenman, Samuel I., 102**  
**Rumely, Edward, 199, 215**  
**Russell, Richard, 30, 32, 34, 36-37,**  
     **39, 46-48, 55, 99**

**s**

**Sabin, Bert, 263**  
**Sammons, Forrest C., 79-91, 103, 108,**  
     **203-4**  
**Sammons, Mrs. Forrest C., 80, 85-86,**  
     **89**  
**Sampson, Mrs. Edith, 223**  
**San Francisco's Chinatown, 268-69**  
**Sanctuary, Eugene Nelson, 134, 144**  
**Sanhedrin, 80-82, 87, 89-90**  
**Sault, David, 286**  
**Saypol, Irving, 227**  
**Schoendorf, R. M. See Freedman,**  
     **Mrs. Benjamin H.**

**Scott, W. Kerr, 238**  
**Scottsboro Boys case, 219, 222-23,**  
     **225**  
**Segal, Milton, 286**  
**Selim Bey, Kamel, 177-78, 180, 191-**  
     **93**  
**Senate Armed Services Committee,**  
     **27-61**  
**Sharpe's Resort, Elkhart Lake, Wis.,**  
     **265**  
**Shepherd, Dr., 120-21**  
**Shishkin, 241**  
**Silver Shirts, 78, 142**  
**Simmons, William Joseph, 111**  
**Sims, George, 297-99**  
***Singapore Straits Times*, 282**  
**Smith, Alfred E., 112, 129, 233, 252**  
**Smith, Gerald L. K., 27, 46-48, 51,**  
     **53-60, 80, 86-89, 108, 128, 134-**  
     **35, 161, 165, 167-68, 174, 176,**  
     **198-207, 215-16, 225-26, 244-48,**  
     **250, 291**  
**Smith, Mrs. Gerald L. K., 86-89, 201-**  
     **2**  
**Smith, Lillian, 70**  
**Smith, Walter Bedell, 59**  
**Smith, Willis, 239, 241**  
**Smythe, Edward James, 28, 140-48**  
**Sons & Daughters of Protestant Vet-**  
     **erans, 142n.**  
**Soul Winning Bible Institute, 127**  
**Spellman, Francis Cardinal, 103**  
**Spiritual Mobilization, 174**  
**Springer, Harvey H., 126-39, 207**  
**St. Louis Anti-Communist League,**  
     **167**  
**Stalin, 22, 106, 154, 188**  
**Starr, George, 36, 41, 50**  
**State Department, 79, 81, 176, 179-**  
     **80, 189-91, 195**  
**Steinbrink, Meier, 84**  
**Stevens, Thaddeus, 158**  
**Stevenson, Adlai, 281**  
**Steward, Jesse L., 124**  
**"Stockholm Appeal," 230**  
**Stoffel, John, 283**  
**Stokes, Jeremiah, 156**  
**Stoneburner, Rev. F. R., 243**  
**Stowe, Harriet Beecher, 90**

# INDEX

- Strauss, Mrs. Harry (Amelia Corkland), 236-38  
 Streicher, Julius, 159  
*Stürmer, Der*, 159, 240  
 Sullivan, Philip L., 125  
 Sullivan, Thomas F., 287  
 Surine, Donald, 34, 48, 51-52, 56-57, 59  
 Swift, Rev. Wesley, 22, 27-28, 30, 40, 53-55, 60, 88, 100-1, 204-5, 246-47
- T
- Taft, Dewey, 203  
 Taft, Robert A., 68, 83, 213-14, 243  
 Talmadge, Herman, 248-49  
 Tanner, Opal M., 244  
 Taylor, Robert R., 269-70  
 Texas Educational Association, 160  
 Thomas, Elbert D., 246-48  
 Thompson, M. E., 248-49  
 Thorkelson, Jacob, 78  
 Thurmond, J. Strom, 161  
 Tobey, Senator Charles W. R., 241-42  
 Topside, Boothbay Harbor, Me., 265  
 Totah, Kalil, 176  
 Trenton Six case, 220-22, 225  
 True, James C., 144  
 Truman, Harry, 26, 82, 84, 105-6, 158-59, 188, 223, 238  
 Turner, C. Russell, 52  
 Turner, Frank, 175-76  
 Tydings, Senator Millard, 28, 30  
 Tyre, Neda, 62
- U
- Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 230n.  
 Unitarian Church, 66  
 United Committee for Civil Rights (Portland, Ore.), 231-32  
 United Jewish Appeal, 83, 170  
 United Mine Workers, 214  
 United Nations, 21, 79, 85, 98-99, 104-7, 134, 137, 171-75, 180, 183-84, 186-88, 195, 209, 238  
 United Office & Professional Workers of America, 225  
 "United States Negro Territory," 163  
*Untold Story of State Medicine, The*, 206  
 U.S.S.R., 186-89  
 Utah Anti-Communist League, 246
- V
- Van Hyning, Lyrl, 207  
 Venet, Jan Lucien, 133  
 Verde Cattle and Guest Ranch, Paulden, Ariz., 265  
 "Victory Stamps," 146  
 Viereck, George Sylvester, 134, 144  
 Vigilants, Inc., 164  
 Voice of America, 175-76, 180
- W
- Wafd party, 188  
 Warburg, Edward M. M., 103  
 Warburg, Paul, 83  
*Warning Letters* (Parker), 114, 116, 118  
*Was Peter the First Pope?*, 138  
 Waterbury, Dr. C. C., 122-24  
 Watson, Thomas E., 111  
 Watson, Thomas J., 102  
 "We, the Mothers Mobilize for America," 207  
 Webb, James, 181  
 Webster, H. B., 236-37  
 Weiss, Dr. Carl A., 87  
 Wener, Lawrence, 264, 267  
 "West Virginia Anti-Soviet League," 82, 87  
*Western Voice, The*, 127, 131, 133, 135, 137  
 Western Voice Book & Bible Supply, 127  
 White, Walter F., 222, 240  
 White American Party, 151, 157  
 White Circle League of America, Inc., 150-56, 165, 282  
*White Circle News, The*, 150-51, 153, 155-57  
*White Horse*, 112

- Whitney, John Hay**, 59  
**Why I Am a Protestant**, 138  
**Why I Am Not a Roman Catholic**, 138  
**WIL**, 167  
**Williams, Robert H.**, 21-22, 28-29n.,  
80, 84, 108, 156, 204, 206, 210-11,  
291  
**Williams Intelligence Summary**, 28n.,  
84, 108, 206, 210-11  
**Williamson, John**, 227-30  
**Wilson, Charles E.**, 158  
**Wilson, George**, 54  
**Wilson, Preston**, 258-59  
**Winchell, Walter**, 61, 84, 88  
**Winnepesaukee, Lake, N.H.**, 264  
**Winner, Mrs. Helen.** *See* De Sola,  
Mrs. Ralph  
**Winrod, Rev. Gerald B.**, 28, 78, 100,  
128, 134, 136, 139, 144, 207-8  
**Women's Voice**, 207  
**Woodbury Soap Co.**, 93  
**World Empire**, 159, 161  
**World Foreign Affairs Council**, 193  
  
**x**  
**XEG**, 136  
**XERB**, 136  
  
**y**  
**Yarrut, Louis H.**, 141  
**Young Egypt**, 99  
**Y.W.C.A.**, 208  
  
**z**  
**Zaki, Moukhtar**, 191  
**Zionist movement**, 94-100, 159-60  
**Zoll, Allen**, 104, 108, 199-200, 207-  
8, 212-13, 216

67 317 A A 30







-

.





